Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

# THE NEW REPUBLIC

*A Journal of Opinion*

VOL. 109, NO. 12 NEW YORK, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1943 NUMBER 1503

## A Turning Point in the War

The second week in September was another of the great climactic turning points in the war, which will cast a long shadow forward over the future. Italy's unconditional surrender had been anticipated, though few people realized it would come so soon; but even those who expected it failed to see fully how the shape of the war would be altered. If the Italian invasion is not yet the second front that the Russians desire, it may easily become so within the next few weeks. Already there is some evidence that Hitler is taking men from the Eastern front in order to use them in places where the invasion of Italy and the Italian surrender have made them necessary. Italians have been replaced by Germans in many points in the Balkans, and this process is likely to be speeded up if and when some of the other satellite countries drop out of the war, as seems altogether probable. Into Italy itself Hitler is pouring men and supplies with a recklessness that seems to indicate he intends to fight for the peninsula to the utmost, and not merely execute a delaying operation. Apparently we shall need every man and every gun that we can possibly put ashore in order to advance to the base of the Alps. Once we get fairly far north in Italy, we can bomb Germany with tremendously better effect than at any time in the past. Shuttle bombers operating between Italy and England can reach every part of the Nazi fortress; and even skeptics now admit that bombing has done great harm.

## The Italian Armistice

The terms of the Italian armistice seem to us about what was to be expected. It followed unconditional surrender and was of course intended to give us maximum military advantage from that surrender. We took Italy's fleet and all her aircraft, and reserved the right to requisition merchant vessels. All Italian territory, plus Corsica, which belongs to France but has been occupied by the Italians, is to be made available to us for our use. Under the tenth point, if Eisenhower thinks of anything else that he forgot the first time, he will include it. These are strict terms, but no more strict than it was reasonable to expect. If there are any political "niggers in the woodpile," they are not apparent on the surface. It looks as though we were learning by experience, in dealing with our enemies.

## Repercussions of Surrender

The Italian surrender will have far-reaching consequences in other theatres of war. Our control of the Mediterranean is more complete than ever, and facilitates moving supplies to Russia by way of Iran (which, by the way, a few days ago, recognized the handwriting on the wall for the Axis by declaring war on Germany). With the Italian fleet, that part of it still afloat, almost entirely in our hands, British and American naval units that were pinned down in the Mediterranean will be available for service in other parts of the world. In particular, they can be used to help Lord Louis Mountbatten in his projected drive into Burma, to reopen the Burma road and pave the way for attack on the Japanese archipelago from China.

If the Balkans are forced to drop out of the war, the strategic effect upon Germany will be enormous. The loss of Rumanian oil, in particular, will be serious though certainly not fatal. In the light of all these factors the rapidity of the German retreat in Russia

CONTENTS

The Week . . . . . 375
Editorials
Wallace's World—and Hull's . . . . . 378
State and Its Critics . . . . . 380
General Articles
The Future of France . . . Louis Dolivet 381
The Rich Get Richer . . . Helen Fuller 383
Watch the Balkans! . . . Bogdan Raditsa 385
What Next in Italy? . . Gaetano Salvemini 387
Is Pegler Right? . . . . Edwin A. Lahey 388
Wheeler of Montana . . . . . Potomacus 390
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 393
Short and Happy . . . . Manny Farber 394
Science and Technology . . . . . 394
The Bandwagon . . . . . 395
Correspondence . . . . . 395
Books in Review
Preface to Tragedy . . Thomas J. Hamilton 398
Notes on a Harvest . . . Milton Klonsky 399
Linguistic Imperialism . . . Albert Guérard 400
Stranger Than Fiction . . Morris L. Ernst 400
The Voice of Enterprise . Ben B. Seligman 401

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

begins to look like a calculated withdrawal. To say this is not to belittle the magnificent achievement of the Russian armies, one of the greatest military feats of modern time. It is quite possible, however, that Hitler, under the increasing menace of Allied arms, has decided—or his general staff has done so for him—to shorten his interior communications by withdrawing almost entirely from Russian soil. If the Balkans should go, he might even need to give up much of Poland.

## Mussolini in German Hands

Although the news that Mussolini had been kidnaped by the Germans was not confirmed as we went to press, we take for granted that it is true. Even the Germans would hardly be sufficiently inept to make such a statement unless it were correct. No doubt they can get some advantage from using him as nominal head of the "government-in-exile" that they have already set up for Italy, with headquarters in Berlin. Somebody blundered badly in letting Mussolini get away; in the absence of any news to the contrary, we assume it was the Badoglio government that was at fault. We doubt, however, that Mussolini has more than about ten cents' worth of value to the Germans. If we may judge by Sicily, 90 percent of the Italians hated the fascists, and 90 percent of the fascists must now feel that Mussolini was singularly incompetent.

## Wire-Tapping in Washington

Mr. Drew Pearson makes the charge that the telephone wires of many Washington newspapermen, including himself, have been tapped by agents of the government. The purpose, Mr. Pearson says, is to find out the names of government officials who are giving information to the newspapers regarding inefficiencies and bottlenecks in government procedure that are hampering the war effort. These are extremely serious charges, and we hope they will be promptly and thoroughly investigated by some agency that will be beyond suspicion of trying to do a whitewashing job for the wire-tappers, if they exist. On a good many occasions in the past, prompt publicity has immeasurably helped the war effort and quite possibly saved us from disaster. The New Republic, for one example, is proud of the part it has played in forcing expansion of steel, aluminum and copper facilities, in pointing out the dangers of American participation in cartels, in urging the navy to build escort vessels, and in many other things. Any government which gets to the point of trying to conceal its blunders, not because reformation is under way, but just in order to make things look better than they really are, is heading for trouble.

## What Happened at Mackinac

The Republican conference on post-war policy at Mackinac Island, Michigan, must be viewed as a trial heat for the platform writers at the national convention of the party next June. The Republicans want desperately to win the 1944 election. To that purpose, they are prepared to promise the people practically anything that they think the people want to hear. But just as every political platform in the past has been disregarded once the party got into power, so these planks are of little significance in seeking to assess what the Republicans will do if they win. The declaration on international coöperation after the war surprised a great many people by its strength; Governor Dewey of New York and Clarence Budington Kelland of Arizona had similarly surprised people a few days earlier by coming out for an alliance with Great Britain. But the plain fact is that the Republican platform makers had been reading the Gallup and other polls more carefully than had those who were surprised. The polls show overwhelming sentiment at the present time in favor of American participation in a worldwide organization to keep the peace.

As we pointed out last week, the Republicans have to live down a bad record of a previous broken promise. In 1920, all their most respected elements joined in a promise of international coöperation if the party won the presidential election that year. Candidate W. G. Harding said the same thing, yet all these promises were forgotten as soon as the party came to power. What possible pledge can now be made that the same thing won't happen again?

## The Republicans' Promises

It is quite true that the historic policy of the Republican Party has been anti-isolationist. It is also true that at least two of its important possible presidential candidates, Willkie and Stassen, are about as good internationalists as President Roosevelt. Even the GOP is capable of changing with the times, although its cultural lag seems to be approximately twenty years. But on the wrong side of the ledger we must record the fact that most of the country's worst isolationists are Republicans; most of the "American Century" imperialists are Republicans; most of the Tory practitioners of big finance and big enterprise, who are least likely to take a fair, democratic view of foreign questions, are Republicans; most of the people who think Russian communism is far worse than German fascism and that we ought to go to war with Russia, are Republicans. These elements will be kept skillfully in the background during the campaign; but they will come out of their holes once their candidate—even a Willkie or a Stassen—has been elected. Among the Republicans, as in every other group, there are good and bad elements; but it is worth remembering that in this party particularly, the bad are powerful and are skillful in concealing their real aims until it is too late to stop them. The Mackinac Island resolutions should be read in the light of that fact.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## Toward Democracy in China

There were some interesting developments at the plenary session of the Kuomintang in Chungking a few days ago. The decision was made to call a People's Congress, one year after the war. This congress will formally adopt the constitution, of which a draft already exists, and will set the date at which the constitution shall come into effect. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek made a speech in which he said that when the new constitution comes into effect, the Kuomintang will hand over all power to the people. From then on it will be just another political party, with no more power and influence than any other. If all this takes place, it will constitute an almost unprecedented example of voluntary relinquishment of authority by what has been, in substance, a military dictatorship.

## Franco Reconsidered

It is high time, on the basis of the facts, for the United States Government to reconsider its general policy toward Franco, and such reconsideration may have begun already. Our government, through a fictitious neutrality, greatly aided Franco during the Spanish civil war, and thereby did a good deal to bring about the Second World War. We did this, it is generally believed in Washington, because of the importance of the American Catholic Church in domestic politics. But the Church was never so unanimous in its support of Franco as it might have seemed. Many Catholics were opposed to fascism, in Spain and everywhere else. Today, that attitude is obviously growing in the ranks of the Church.

We think President Roosevelt should earnestly consider whether the time has not arrived for a firm atitude against Franco, who after all is keeping thousands of his troops in Russia, fighting against our ally. The notion that we had to placate him to keep him from openly joining the Axis does not stand up. Franco would have joined Hitler long ago if he had been able. He stayed neutral because he had to, and his necessity is worse now than at any time in the past. The moment has arrived for us to treat him as he deserves.

## Argentina and the Catholics

We nominate for the world's worst example of bad timing the recent actions of Argentina. This country chose to go fascist at the very moment when fascism was beginning to crumble visibly all over the world. The action is about as bright as that of a man who would insist on entering a burning hotel and going to bed, just when the firemen have abandoned all hope of saving the structure. Secretary Hull was exactly right in his blunt refusal to give Argentina, under her present government, any of the benefits of Lend-Lease or other aspects of United Nations coöperation. The situation is regrettable mainly because there is good evidence that the overwhelming majority of the Argentine people are strongly pro-democratic. Only the little group of the wealthy at the top, plus the army and the church, favor the present fascist course.

Dispatches from Buenos Aires say that the Catholic Church is playing a very important role in the present fascist tendency. It takes its cue, of course, from the Catholic Church in Spain, which has been a steadfast supporter of Franco's fascist regime. But the Church in Argentina is likewise guilty of bad timing. As the downfall of Germany grows nearer, and with Italy already out of the war, Franco's own position becomes more precarious. Even the American State Department bluntly refused, only the other day, to give him the arms and ammunition for which he asked, whose only probable use would be either to help Hitler or to put down a possible uprising of the Spanish masses. It is reasonably certain that Italy will soon be in the hands of the Allies. The Vatican will then be surrounded by anti-fascist influences, which has not been true for twenty years past. The Church rarely continues very long in the mistake of betting on a dying horse. It is likely to turn away from fascism in Spain; and when it does, the prelates of Argentina will realize what a blunder they have made.

## Keeping Labor off the Air

When President Mark Woods of the Blue Network recently testified before the Federal Communications Commission on the transfer of the network to the newly formed American Broadcasting Company, the sidelights of his testimony were much more interesting and revealing than his major statement. The FCC commissioners took the occasion to ask some rather searching questions about the refusal of the networks to sell broadcasting time to labor unions, coöperative associations and other progressive groups.

Woods's answers were startlingly candid in a town used to slick evasions from witnesses at investigations. He casually admitted that policies on granting air time for the expression of special points of view differed sharply between large industrial corporations and groups like trade unions. The latter want to convince the public of their specific ideas, and therefore are not sold time in which to do it. Industrial firms, on the other hand, are not questioned on their material.

The commissioners raised the question of William J. Cameron's controversial remarks on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour. Woods said that was all right. "We consider Mr. Cameron as speaking his own view and not necessarily that of the Ford Motor Company." The commissioners took note of a possible coincidence between the two. Commissioner Clifford J. Durr summarized this blatant policy of discrimination in this manner: "You sell time to General Motors, so they can show they have done a good job making planes. Yet you would not sell to the United Auto Workers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are also making planes and doing a good job." To which Mr. Woods replied: "That is correct. . . ."

### Baruch Tackles Manpower

Major details of a confidential report on manpower which Bernard Baruch has submitted to War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes have "leaked" to the press. Its main emphases cover the problem thoroughly and forthrightly. With due modesty, we point out that the Baruch report contains few if any points not recommended in these pages many months ago. Most of them were first spotlighted by the Tolan Committee almost two years ago.

Baruch properly urges that occupation alone must be the criterion for the granting of deferments under the Selective Service Act and points out the glaring defects in the present farm-labor-deferment policy. He underlines the importance of the current West Coast experiment in manpower mobilization and correctly argues that national service legislation by itself is no answer to our manpower problems. Efficient administration of manpower mobilization must be achieved first, legislation or no legislation. We hope that the Baruch report may provide the spark needed for a full reconsideration of the manpower phase of this war.

### The Aircraft Crisis

The Baruch report on manpower lists aircraft as the No. 1 production problem. The day before news of the report leaked out, Richard Frankensteen, vice-president of the United Auto Workers and director of its Aircraft Division, made public a plan to overcome recent production failures in the aircraft industry. Frankensteen particularly argued against any "labor draft" as a corrective measure. "Over-all planning for total production" is the only real answer, he contended. ". . . Where both management and government have failed to take a whole series of steps to solve the manpower problem, to develop arbitrary administrative controls over labor is to throw upon labor the full burden of sacrifice and adjustment for the derelictions of others." He went on to warn that unless basic steps toward correction of the real trouble are taken, manpower shortages will threaten all aircraft plants within the next few months: "The Boeing affair is only a foretaste of what may develop throughout the nation unless proper measures are undertaken to plan and organize for the most effective use of labor in aircraft plants. . . . The Office of War Mobilization has clearly failed to meet the emergency."

### The United Nations and Food

Since the Hot Springs meeting of the United Nations Food Conference adjourned, representatives of the member nations have been at work putting the decisions and proposals of the conference into proper form for presentation to the various governments for official approval. An Interim Commission was set up for the purpose, and this group has now drafted a proposed agreement on the mutual obligations of the United Nations to raise world living standards as regards food. The commission is also working on administrative plans for a permanent United Nations Food Commission and for action during the transition period. All of these questions should be ready for decision by the end of this year, it is estimated. The importance of prompt and enthusiastic approval of these proposals cannot be overestimated. The high hopes that the Food Conference would be the first step in a rapid and extensive series of such meetings are already waning. Official adoption of the Hot Springs program for a permanent United Nations food machinery would help restore those hopes.

## Wallace's World—and Hull's

IF THERE WERE ANY DOUBT that there is a strong wind blowing once more away from isolationism after the war and toward internationalism, it should be dispelled by the speeches last week of Vice President Wallace and Secretary Hull. Both of them were made in the shadow of a possible third world war. Both looked primarily to its avoidance. Both were realistic as to methods. The difference between them was the difference between a minimum program and a maximum. Hull contented himself with stating the minimum international action without which a secure peace would be unthinkable. Wallace was bold enough to strike out to the full reach of what could be done.

Hull's statement would have exacted more confidence if it had been made before the Republican post-war conference at Mackinac rather than after it. While the official Vandenberg-Taft declaration of that conference blew hot and cold on the question of American action in a post-war world, there were two Republicans who went beyond it. Governor Dewey asked specifically for an Anglo-American alliance to which Russia and China would be admitted. And Clarence Budington Kelland went further, presenting five alternative "zones of safety," including binding international commitments for collective security. When an opportunist politician and a former isolationist talk in such terms, the spokesman for administration foreign policy does not deserve hosannas for coming out against isolationism.

Yet in one respect Hull went beyond Dewey and Kelland, and far beyond the official Mackinac statement of the Republicans. He was frank and realistic about the need for using collective international force to check aggression after this war. To be sure the alliances suggested by Dewey and Kelland also look toward the use of force. But there is a wide gap between force in an alliance system, and force to back up a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comprehensive international association. The former can easily become a phase of a balance-of-power alignment, with various nations scrambling to form alliances *against* each other, or to swing their weight between one alliance and another. It can thus speed and intensify a war, rather than prevent it. The latter means the overwhelming threat of force by the whole world community against any aggressor nation. Force thereby becomes a phase of policing, an arm of justice. It becomes a prophylactic against war. The very threat of using it makes the use of it unnecessary.

It is good to have the administration committed thus to a program of post-war collective security—and committed, moreover, by one of the leaders of its conservative wing. That still leaves, however, the problem of carrying out the commitment. Secretary Hull would have inspired more confidence on this score if his record on collective security in the past had been a better one. There was the crucial aggression, in Europe, of Germany and Italy against Spain during the Spanish civil war: yet the State Department put a ban on the export of arms and munitions to help the Spanish democrats. There was the crucial aggression, in the Far East, of Japan against China: yet the State Department allowed the continued exportation of scrap iron and oil to Japan. American liberals will be forgiven a degree of skepticism when they match the word against the deed and find the latter wanting. And they will be forgiven also a degree of insistence that if the new declaration of policy by the State Department is to be trusted, it must be carried out by a personnel more aware of the realities of world politics and economics than the present personnel of the Department.

As we review American foreign policy in the past decade, two big doubts stand out. One is our doubt whether State Department officials have gone beyond formal legalisms and have understood the economic preconditions to a secure peace. The other is our doubt whether they have understood how important the democratic idea is to a secure peace. On both scores Henry Wallace's speech at Chicago stands out for its realism.

Wallace's world is the real world that the ordinary man knows, in which the imperative is the daily struggle for enough to live on and security for the future. It is easy enough for most liberals to inveigh against isolationism and call for internationalism. It is harder to see what Hull has now seen—that internationalism cannot be had without binding commitments on the part of America to a world community of some sort. But it is hardest of all to see what Wallace sees—that even binding political agreements and legal commitments cannot hold together the structure of world peace unless the underpinning is there, in the form of economic health both in America and in the world as a whole.

Wallace's speech was remarkably cohesive because, starting from several different angles, he always came back to this central truth and drove it home. His most courageous and dramatic way of putting it was in the form of an attack on economic monopoly within America and international cartels between American and foreign corporations. He gave an extended case history of the patent agreements between Standard Oil of New Jersey and I. G. Farben (the dye-industry cartel) of Germany. From the outraged reply of Standard Oil's president, one might think that Wallace had invented these charges, or at least had muckraked them unconscionably. But the fact is that he had ample source material spread out in cold and merciless evidence on the records of the Truman Committee hearings—some of which has since been interpreted in the Borkin and Welsh book, "Germany's Master Plan," and in Guenter Reimann's "Patents for Hitler." Wallace sees one of the great truths of the international politics of our time—that isolationist doctrine is often the screen behind which the super-government of the international cartels gets freedom to carry on its operations. He sees also that, while cartels mean exorbitant profits for the corporations themselves, for the nation and the world they help to create economic scarcity, periodic depression and economic tensions. He sees finally that it is from this soil that war grows and thrives.

It is another facet of this central insight to say, as Wallace implies, that the most important of the Four Freedoms from the angle of an enduring world peace is freedom from want. For freedom of speech and religion and freedom from fear are the *consequences* of a world that has organized to prevent dictatorship and war. But freedom from want is the basic precondition. There are many who have attacked Wallace's ideas on a world economy as visionary. Actually it is truer to say that only those who ignore the economic conditions of world peace walk with their heads in the clouds. Wallace again proposes that the peoples in Europe, China and India be aided to set up self-liquidating projects to utilize their resources more fully and raise their living standards; that America furnish the engineering services and finance the sale of machinery and machine tools. As a result, "jobs will be created in Chicago and Detroit, and there will be a better market for the Iowa farmer." If this be utopianism, then what America needs is more utopian thinkers of the same stripe.

Perhaps the sharpest difference between Wallace's world and Hull's lies in their relation to the idea of democracy and the dynamics of social change. Hull's emphasis is throughout on political stability. There is an almost obsessive preoccupation with stable regimes, no matter what their price may be in social rigidity and in accumulating internal social tensions. Wallace, on the other hand, sees that stability cannot be legislated either by a dictatorial power or by the fact of the United Nations. Stability can be only the consequence of democratic fulfilment. "There is certain to be revo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lution," he says, "until the seven freedoms are obtained. . . . The only question is the speed of the revolution, and whether it be peaceful or violent."

Such talk takes courage in these days of weasel-worded public utterances. But in the long run the recognition of its truth can do far more to win an enduring peace than the timid shrinking from it. For the revolution that Wallace is talking of is the social change stirring among every people in the world, seeking its outlet in new democratic freedoms. It is the democratic revolution. The effort to achieve world peace cannot content itself with words. If it is to succeed, it needs the *élan* of the democratic idea, rousing the enthusiasm and evoking the best efforts of men all over the world.

## State and Its Critics

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and Secretary Hull get very angry when liberals criticize the policy of the State Department, and this is easy to understand. It is normal human nature to resent any attack, no matter how well justified it may be. A common proceeding is to begin by denying that you are in any way at fault, then to admit to yourself that there may be something in what the critic said, and to end up by seeking to mend your ways. Very rarely does anybody seek out the critic and thank him for his admonitions. Indeed, the fact of reformation is quite often cited as proof that the critic was wrong in the first place; a little juggling of dates is all that is necessary to make this seem plausible.

Something like this may well have happened in connection with several important aspects of American foreign policy. When American liberals attacked King Victor Emmanuel, the President was angry; but two months later, the joint British-American appeal to Italy significantly omitted any mention of the King. This is not a very explicit apology to the liberals, but it will serve.

For years, Americans on the Left have attacked our policy of appeasing fascist elements in Latin America. Nobody in Washington has ever said we were right; yet Secretary Hull has now denounced the present government of Argentina in terms as strong as anybody could ask.

The appeasement of Franco has been another sore point. In general, this appeasement perhaps continues; yet our government found the courage to tell him flatly that he could not have arms and ammunition, which he could only intend to use to our ultimate disadvantage. And it has been a long time now since the United States Ambassador at Madrid, Carlton Hayes, has made a speech praising Franco's "achievements."

American progressives were sharply critical of our official government policy which withheld recognition from the French Committee for National Liberation; and some of them demanded that Robert Murphy, our representative in North Africa, be recalled because of his pro-Vichy orientation. The committee has now been recognized, and The New York Times says Mr. Murphy is on his way home and will not be sent back. There are stories that his superiors are none too pleased because he kept reporting that everyone in France was opposed to General de Gaulle, whereas on the contrary nearly everyone in France appears to favor him.

For many months, the liberals demanded the abolition of extraterritoriality in China; they were told haughtily by Washington that such a thing was out of the question; yet extraterritoriality has now been abolished.

In regard to Russia, they criticized the policy of excluding her from political decisions in the Mediterranean area. The new Mediterranean Committee, just set up to deal with the whole region in a political sense, includes Russian membership.

There was a pretty little plan to make Otto Hapsburg head of an Austrian Legion. The liberals objected strongly, and the plan has been dropped. They have had a similar success, evidently, in ending the State Department's flirtation with pro-fascist Hungarian elements in the United States.

It is obviously much too early to say that the State Department has undergone any sweeping reformation. There are still undesirable men in it, and undesirable tendencies. Yet the list is impressive, of policy changes demanded by the liberals and now put into effect. We of course don't expect any State Department apologist to admit that pressure from the liberals brought about any of these things. They will continue, as Mr. Arthur Krock of The New York Times has been doing, to argue that if something is done eventually, that is proof that the previous clamor for it was unnecessary. That is all right with the liberals, if we may be permitted to speak for them. What they want is results and not medals.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

*A Journal of Opinion*

*Editors:* BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

*Managing Editor:* THOMAS SANCTON

*Treasurer:* DANIEL MEBANE

*Assistant Editors:* ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

*Contributing Editors:* H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

*Advertising Manager:* E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Future of France

THE French Committee of National Liberation has now been recognized by the chief powers among the United Nations—wholeheartedly by Russia, and in a limited way by the United States and Great Britain. What happens next? How do the people of France feel about it? What is the future? And what lessons can be drawn from the French experience that will be useful in dealing with other countries now under German domination?

As far as public utterances are concerned, things are going well. The expressions of appreciation by Generals de Gaulle and Giraud, as well as the first comments after the recognition by René Masigli, Commisioner of Foreign Affairs, were extremely courteous and were characterized by a politeness which indicates that the diplomatic staff of the Quay d'Orsay is being partially reconstructed in Algiers. The old experienced diplomats succeeded in finding phrases which, while marked by slight but nevertheless very expressive nuances in the answers addressed to the different governments, hid completely any disappointment whatsoever.

But the limited recognition has provoked none of the enthusiastic popular expressions of joy which normally would have followed the full return of France into the ranks of the Allies. The popular reaction was as cool as the recognition itself. It should be stated again and again that the limitations to the recognition of the committee were considered by everyone as favoring the ultra-conservatives and not the democratic elements.

The people of France, because of the series of disasters through which they have gone since 1940, needed something more than careful diplomatic phrases. They needed a wholehearted welcome back as equal partners within the ranks of the United Nations, which would have given them the hope that they would be able to regain their former place in the world. Had the recognition come as a solemn decision of all the United Nations, and had it been drafted somewhat along the lines of the recognition by Soviet Russia, then it would have revitalized all the French energies, and it would have been of the greatest help to the French democratic forces. For the building of democracy is encountering serious difficulties. The Nazi and Vichy propagandists have been free during two and a half years to spread their teachings in a colonial set-up which, by the very nature of its political and economic structure, offered a most favorable terrain.

The Germans, as long as they were in control, paid the highest prices for everything and organized the oligarchic trusts called "groupments," encouraged the profiteering of French colonials, spread anti-Semitism and organized a systematic hate campaign against England, America and Soviet Russia. They were careful to speak only in the most respectful terms of France, and to underline at every opportunity that in the New Order the French would have an important role in the direction of European affairs.

When the Allied invasion came, instead of a complete break with the past and a full return to French democratic principles, the colonies were offered Darlan and his whole Vichyite clique. The few months of a policy of expediency—a short period in history, but a long one in the psychological orientation of fascist-minded people—strengthened the belief that even an Allied victory would not end the French brand of fascism. Today those same forces are going on repeating that the Americans and the British will again abandon France as they did after the last war, and that therefore the only solution for France remains to reach an understanding with Germany—whatever Germany there may be.

Such is the atmosphere in which the Committee of National Liberation has undertaken its gigantic task to break down the remnants of fascist ideologies, chauvinistic conceptions and anti-American and anti-British feeling that exist at almost every level of the administrative hierarchy.

In order to succeed, the committee needs to be able to oppose the wave of fascism with—apart from the necessary measures of repression—a positive counter-program of democratic French and world reconstruction. The committee must be able to explain that the Allies are representing those ideals for which the people of France have always fought. It must be able to say that this time neither France nor any other nation will be abandoned to its fate in case of aggression; that real security, together with political and economic democracy, will follow this war. It must be able to say to the people that France has again become a full-fledged member of the United Nations and that her voice is being heard in those councils which are dealing with Italy and with the other problems of the reorganization of Europe. The committee, in order to function effectively, must be able to feel a sense of security and stability, which cannot exist as long as the committee's desire to be considered as qualified to defend French interests "must be reserved for consideration in each case as it arises."

The committee has four main problems to solve:

1. The full mobilization of all resources and manpower;
2. The maintenance of the closest coöperation with the French Underground;
3. The reëstablishment of the laws of the Third Republic in all freed territories;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. Participation in the Allied councils and in the decision-making bodies which affect the peace to come.

It is self-evident that each one of these four problems requires a great amount of effective authority concentrated in the hands of the committee. As a matter of fact, Algiers has already tackled each of these four main problems. At the meeting on September 3, it decided "to increase the war effort of France by regulating in its entirety the military or civil mobilization of French citizens and subjects residing in the Empire or in foreign countries." This would mean the extension of the military authority of Algiers over all Frenchmen, wherever they might be found. But the mobilization of French citizens, particularly those residing outside the colonial possessions of France, is impossible without Allied consent. However, a general mobilization must be immediate and must reach all subjects if it is to be effective; otherwise, it is a decision on paper only, and in the present situation, at least for a certain time, there will be uncertainty on this subject.

As far as the second problem—that of the Underground—is concerned, there undoubtedly exists effective coöperation, established a long time ago by de Gaulle, who was helped in this task particularly by André Philip, Commissioner of the Interior. In the last week or two the Algiers committee has been considerably strengthened by the arrival of François de Menthon, who has been appointed Commissioner of Justice. The Underground is gaining influence every day, and has already shown a great degree of political maturity. And it intends to preserve its prerogatives.

The organization and coördination of the Underground in France has made such progress that already it can be considered as the most effective political force representing the anti-fascist fighting people of France. The Underground, having given its approval to the constitution of the Committee of National Liberation, naturally expects that committee to be considered as the temporary authority of France.

As far as the reëstablishment of the legislation of the Third Republic is concerned, it has also been a most laudable practice of General de Gaulle from the beginning to cancel all Vichy or Nazi-inspired legislation immediately, and to reëstablish fully the constitutional legality of the Third Republic. However, in this respect, the Algiers committee now seems to be moving a little more slowly, as was the case with the first National Committee of London. The inclusion of ultra-conservative elements in the committee and the general atmosphere of uneasiness, particularly with regard to the Allied relationships, may be responsible for it. However, the committee seems more and more to be taking things in hand, and will undoubtedly in a short time put an end to all survivals of the expediency period.

The most important problem seems to this writer to be the fourth—that of French participation in Allied councils. France has an old habit of and liking for participation in international organization. She has often taken the initiative in international fields. Congresses and conferences of all kinds—of a scientific, political, artistic and literary nature—have often been held in France, and the people liked them. The sense of frustration because of the defeat and betrayal in the last few years has undoubtedly increased the desire of France to participate once again in international affairs. Therefore, the question is often asked, "When shall we again be admitted to international regulations and discussions, particularly concerning the Mediterranean and Europe?" As a matter of fact, French participation in these negotiations would be no burden at all for the Allies. On the contrary, it would be most helpful to the Allied cause because of the sympathy for France which has existed for many years throughout Europe.

It is too late to argue what form the recognition of the committee should have taken. But it is not too late to insist on the establishment of the closest relationship with it. For in the Europe of tomorrow, a democratic France will be of vital importance, both for spreading the ideals of freedom and for the establishment of a system of collective security on the European continent.

One can understand and readily subscribe to any precaution that is taken in order to guarantee to the French people their freedom of expression after the liberation of their national soil. No serious-minded Frenchman or friend of France would want to spoil in the slightest degree the fullest and freest opportunity of the French people to give themselves the government and institutions they want. But the French committee of Algiers is in full agreement with this conception, and every one of the measures taken by it indicates that it intends to reëstablish the functioning of the constitutional legislation as soon as France is free.

Limitations like those which have been proclaimed cannot effectively strengthen the guarantees for the consultation of the people of France but, on the contrary, risk creating a strong nationalistic feeling which might even be directed against the Allies. And there is no greater danger for the peace of tomorrow than a nationalistic France.

It is evident that the major Allied powers have to take all precautions to avoid the recognition of the wrong committee. In the case of the Algiers committee, it has behind it the united French Underground movement, including the powerful trade-union movement, the CGT (Confédération Generale du Travail), the Christian trade unions, the Radical Socialist, Socialist and Communist Parties, and the democratic parties of the Center. Outside France, all the veteran organizations of French resistance, such as France Forever in the United States and various Free French

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organizations all over the world, are also supporting the Committee of National Liberation. All these forces favor a democratic and progressive policy.

There will be in France, as all over the world, dangerous moments in the struggle to establish full democracy. In this struggle the United Nations can be of utmost help if they adopt a genuine democratic policy. Their language is listened to very intently in France and in the whole of Europe. That language must be adapted to the circumstances. The United Nations are no longer speaking to diplomats and habitués of government offices. They are speaking to the plain people —workers and farmers, dockhands and fighting teachers, to young men who have seen the horrors of Nazism and who know what it means. They are speaking to people who are tired of the divisions of Europe and who want finally to achieve a peaceful order. They understand a plain language of common sense proclaiming the ideals of justice and freedom, which have been the basic principles of the French and American revolutions. They don't understand complicated, anachronistic diplomatic formulas.

Therefore in the final analysis the fight of the French people, not only against the Nazis but against their own fascists and ultra-conservative forces, will depend on the general policy of the United Nations. If the United Nations are effectively organized into a powerful democratic body, if they are adopting a system of international organization based on law, democracy and coöperation, then no fears need be felt about France's future. On the contrary, in a democratic world she will be one of the most progressive elements of that world of freedom for which this war is being fought.

LOUIS DOLIVET

# The Rich Get Richer

THE FAT CATS of American war industry are not satisfied with their cream ration. They have raised such a howl about the beating they are taking from present excess-profits-tax rates and from the present Contract Renegotiation Act that the House Ways and Means Committee came back to Washington a full week in advance of the rest of the Congress to open hearings on this whole question.

When you look at the corporate-profits figures for last year and the years just before, and at the estimates for this year, it is hard to see what kind of argument industry could offer in support of decreasing its share of the general financial burden of this war. But a look back at the flimsy arguments that have recently been camouflaged with a twist of a statistic or the turn of a phrase to present the American worker's pay envelope as our one inflationary threat makes it easier to guess what arguments Congress will hear on its tax policies during the new session, from one section of industry at least.

A large-scale and subtle program of tax propaganda has filled the press and the air for months now. It soaks into your skin if you don't watch out. American industry —the Private Enterprise Your Soldier Wants to Come Home to (if you believe the tax-exempt ads)—is taking a beating. It gets the stuff there on time, but Uncle Sam takes no notice of that when tax-collection days come round. And in spite of 90-percent tax rates on excess profits, industry is not allowed to pile up the reserves it wants to use to guarantee a job for Your Boy when he comes marching home again. It is subject to renegotiation of its contracts without allowance for reserves and before taxes are deducted.

The facts do not exactly jibe with this propaganda. Take profits, for instance. Authoritative estimates indicate that corporate profits for 1943, before taxes, will amount to approximately $23,000,000,000; 1942 profits were slightly over $19,000,000,000. That increase does not seem to be any signpost to the poorhouse. Profits for all corporations in the previous peak year of 1929 were $9,300,000,000. After taxes, 1943 corporate profits are estimated at $8,500,000,000, as compared with $7,500,000,000 for 1942. Nineteen twenty-nine yielded $8,100,000,000 in corporate profits after taxes. Thus this year, in spite of the terrible "beating" industry has been taking, its profits will be $1,000,000,000 more than last year, and $400,000,000 more than 1929 profits.

Propaganda aside, it is not too hard to understand how this can be. Last year's tax law prohibits taxing a corporation more than 80 percent of its total profits, and in the many cases where a company's profits are six to ten times the normal rate, even an 80-percent tax leaves a healthy margin. One special study of twenty-nine big corporations made recently showed that all but six at least doubled their normal peacetime profits, after taxes were paid, last year. Several of the companies studied multiplied their earnings four or five times, and one reached the stupendous figure of almost 100 times its normal pre-war (1936-39) level.

When we entered this war, we remembered all the cases of profiteering from the last war which had been aired through the twenties and resolved to prevent their recurrence this time. We would not have the war millionaires and the public scandals our former wars produced, or so Congress told the people. That was no new resolve. Between February, 1919, and 1942, some 170 bills and resolutions aimed at preventing war profiteering were introduced in Congress. Only two inadequate measures had been passed before the Re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

negotiation Act became law on April 28, 1942. The statute gives authority to four executive agencies to renegotiate their contracts and subcontracts whenever it appears that excessive profits are being realized under present terms. There is great flexibility in the method. Each case is determined on its own merits, and there is no standard yardstick. Price Adjustment Boards of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission conduct investigations and make decisions. Up to May 31, 1943, the War Department board alone had recovered or adjusted in prices on contracts $2,100,000,000. The members of these boards could not by any stretch of the imagination be accused of a New Deal bias, or even of progressive prejudices. The chairman of the War Department board, which handles much the highest percentage of cases, is the president of the Jewel Tea Company (Lehman Brothers). These three agencies and the Treasury testified to the extent of thousands of pages of records before congressional committees last session that the present renegotiation system is equitable and workable and that any industry plans for amending the present law to provide for including post-war reserves as costs before renegotiation and for deducting taxes before renegotiation must be considered as unworkable and inadequate.

Yet industry is going forward with these very plans and will present them and urge them at the Ways and Means Committee hearings now going on in the House. One Representative, Hampton Fulmer of South Carolina, respected on both sides of the House for his integrity, has already exposed this pressure play: "War contractors and war industries . . . are operating under a guaranteed 'plus-profit' contract. . . . When the war ends they are guaranteed against any losses. . . . The only safeguard that the government has in connection with 'plus-profits' contracts is the renegotiation provision passed by the Congress. Those who operate under government contracts, especially the large, monopolistic groups, are now flooding congressmen and the country with tons and tons of propaganda . . . urging the repeal of the renegotiation provision, having in mind being in a position to get away with untold profits."

The groups referred to by Representative Fulmer are not putting all their eggs in the congressional basket. While they are waiting for revision or repeal of the non-profiteering law, they are using other techniques for evasion of their full tax responsibilities. Dividends are very low, less than in 1936 or 1937, for instance. Earnings thus retained become additional invested capital either in the form of reserves or as the basis for mergers with companies short on resources but long on unused excess-profits credit, that is, companies which earned more in the normal profit years 1936-39 than they are earning now. Automobile-finance companies are especially good subjects for this kind of deal. For instance, the West Coast auto-finance company, Pacific Finance, was recently purchased by Lockheed Aircraft, a heavy profit maker, for $3,750,000. The large excess-profits credit Pacific brings with it as dowry will greatly decrease the amount of taxes Lockheed will have to pay this year.

The estimates government representatives are planning to bring into the congressional hearings as to corporate reserves should knock the props out from under the industry case for modification of the Renegotiation Act to provide additional finances for reconversion. The figures show that by the end of this year, $20,000,000,000 in undistributed profits will have accumulated as reserve in the war years, a record amount of "seed corn," almost four times the total accumulated reserve for the 1936-39 period. But record reserves are evidently not enough for record profiteers. The National Industrial Conference Board, sophisticated sister to the NAM, has recently brought out a study on reserves and reconversion which supports the position that reserves should not be considered as excess profits in renegotiation proceedings. Tom Girdler's Consolidated Aircraft Corporation is leading an aircraft drive for this proposition. The NAM's journalist friends are grinding out copy, and the push for repeal is steaming along in spite of the present generous allowed reserve of 10 percent of excess profits.

The 1942 tax law has a tremendous loophole for reserve-minded taxpayers. It permits corporations to claim refunds for two years after the war for post-war losses, that is, earnings below normal peacetime profits. Pay now; collect your refund when you are up against reconversion later. Some companies have gone in for the less imaginative device of special pension funds for executives, setting aside undistributed profits with which to buy large annuities for their top men after age sixty-five when their income tax will amount to far less than the one based on their full compensation now. (The Treasury now frowns on this procedure.)

Representatives of the men and the organizations who want repeal of the Renegotiation Act and drastic slashes in even the present weak tax program are already swarming over Capitol Hill, though the session is only begun. Talk of a federal sales tax is current. The Treasury is shy about revealing what its program for next year is to be—if any. The CIO has issued its statement on tax policy which, among other things, calls for increasing corporate-profits taxes from 40 to 55 percent, controlling the various tax-evasion devices now in practice and especially for wiping out the refund provisions of the present tax law which would in some cases return $140 or $150 for every $100 paid in.

The tax fight is certain to be one of the major battles of this new session. The trend of this first series of House Ways and Means Committee hearings will be a good indication whether or not a few weeks with their constituents have made congressmen change their tax views in any major respect.

*Washington* HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Watch the Balkans!

ITALY'S UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER changes in a lightning flash the whole situation in the Balkans. The Balkan peoples now finally see open before them the road to freedom from Axis domination. The importance of the Balkans for Germany is shown by the speed with which German troops have occupied all strategic points in the Balkan area—formerly held by Italian troops—from the Northern Adriatic to the Aegean Sea, from Yugoslavia to Greece. Germany is demanding of her satellites, Hungary and Bulgaria, that they take an active part in defending the Balkans for the Germans. The Greek and Yugoslav guerrillas and their national-liberation armies will probably have to hold on in the mountains, waiting for the Allied landing. Then they will join what will become the Balkan war of national liberation. The fact that in Yugoslavia alone the Germans have taken 40,000 hostages shows how greatly the Germans fear an Allied invasion through the Balkans, aided by the heroic Balkan fighters. What is the present political picture?

One thing to note is that fascism has never gained any real foothold in the Balkans. These are peasant countries; and the peasants, with their shrewd common sense, laughed at the Fascist philosophy, though since the Fascists had guns, they were discreet in their public expressions. Hitler and Mussolini were able to bribe a few traitors in the cities, in government circles, but that is all. The majority remain true to their own rather simple concepts, founded upon a broad humanitarianism, and will rejoice at Italy's fall. To understand this, one must recall how Italian imperialism expressed itself in these states.

Fascist Italy has always considered the Balkans, along with Africa, as the road to imperialistic expansion. In 1935, when Italy embarked on the Ethiopian conquest, many Balkan statesmen believed that they would be spared Fascist imperialism. That was a transitory illusion of the gullible and the greedy, who saw a possibility of preserving the independence of the Balkans by making agreements with Mussolini. After the Ethiopian adventure, the bearers of Fascist "civilization" returned to Europe. With the bombing of the island of Corfu, Mussolini began his policy of deceit and enslavement in the Balkans. He adopted various guises. In the case of Albania, he was obtrusive and aggressive. After giving King Zog the role of an Italian agent in Albania under the cloak of so-called national independence, he threw him out of his country on Easter day. In Bulgaria, in collaboration with the House of Savoy, he won over the Bulgarian royal court, to the distinct dissatisfaction of the Bulgarian peasant masses. In Rumania he appealed to "Latin solidarity" against the "Slav peril" in the Balkans. In Greece he worked with Venizelos, and availed himself of Metaxas' fascist dictatorship until he finally ventured his "stab in the back," for which he was dishonorably beaten by the valiant Greek people. As for Yugoslavia, he cunningly worked to create and intensify dissensions between the Serbs and the Croats, alternately appearing as a friend of Belgrade and then of Zagreb. Having assassinated King Alexander in Marseilles, with the help of Ante Pavelich's Ustashis and the Bulgar-Macedonian terrorists, Mussolini offered Yugoslavia his pledge for the preservation of her independence, territorial integrity and neutrality. Certain Yugoslav statesmen, from Prince Paul to Milan Stoyandinovich, believed that Mussolini could be used to divert Germany from the Balkans. This illusion was kept alive until Mussolini carried out his criminal "stab in the back." After the successful national revolution of March 27, whereby the country had proudly spurned the pact with the enemy, Yugoslavia was attacked in the same fascist manner at the very moment when certain Yugoslav politicians had an airplane ready to take off for Rome for the purpose of persuading Mussolini to prevent war in the Balkans. Only Turkey remained neutral.

When the system of Balkan security was destroyed by Mussolini's attack on Greece and later on Yugoslavia, fascist Italy divided the Balkans with Nazi Germany. The former kept the parts of Yugoslavia and Greece from the Adriatic and the Aegean seas to the Mediterranean, while the later retained territories in the Danube regions which were richer and more important for the strategic communications with the Near East. Italy established the so-called "Independent State of Croatia" on the pattern of Slovakia, which has remained today in the German sphere of influence. After sending the well known leader of the Ustashis, Ante Pavelich, to Zagreb, Mussolini stamped upon this patchwork every characteristic of vassalage. Always conniving with the Savoy dynasty, the fascist dictator bestowed the crown of Croatia upon the Duke of Spoleto, who not only never visited his kingdom but, two days after Mussolini's downfall, abdicated the Croatian throne.

From the first to the last day of occupation, Mussolini never subdued the Balkans. Neither in Yugoslavia nor in Greece was he able to make good his conquest. The Balkans proved to be barren soil for fascism. A handful of political crackpots and untalented literary men have tried to bring fascism to the rugged Balkan terrain. However, the masses, guided by their innate horse-sense philosophy as well as by their well organized peasant movements, as in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Rumania, flatly rebuffed the political expansion of the Fascist invaders. The genuine and uncorrupted intelligentsia of the Balkans, which was profoundly attached to the native soil and intermingled with the people, placed itself at the helm of resistance against Italy and Germany. Revolutionary and rebellious movements which first sprang up in Yugoslavia (whether in Serbia, Croatia or Slovenia), all defined their resistance not only as the awakening of nationalism but also as a broader human struggle against fascism. In the ideological struggle against fascism, they have particularly laid stress on the necessity of resurrecting a new humanism, a humanism which makes man the main and fundamental criterion in relation to war and peace, society and civilization.

Of course the wind from the Russian steppes, which almost invariably brings the Balkans clearer and fresher weather, had a decisive effect. The Balkan intelligentsia had long ago begun to question the soundness of the spiritual guidance of Western Europe. Italian fascism and German Nazism, with all their implications, were more than enough to shatter their potential faith in either Rome or Berlin. The spiritual disintegration of Paris, which manifested itself in perhaps the greater part of French literature and thought, had indicated somewhat earlier the forthcoming crash of the French state, and France could serve no longer as an incentive to resistance. Of Western Europe only ruin remained, the wreck of ideas and philosophies faltering and flinching in action. The influence of Britain had waned. In Greece, surrounded by the Mediterranean, faith in British naval power had always been strong; but even there the sympathies of the intellectuals have been drawn toward Russia by the trend of the war. In Yugoslavia faith in Russia has always been strongly emotional. It is therefore no wonder that in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia the best and strongest part of the intelligentsia has joined the people in the woods and mountains and placed itself at the head of the guerrillas.

The political crisis of the United Nations—which I am sorry to say lies chiefly in the fact that the children of the American Revolution lack the courage to recognize the right of the European peoples to win their democratic freedom through a democratic revolution—had its sanguinary overture on Yugoslavian terrain. London and Washington immediately pronounced the Balkan resistance a struggle of communism v. fascism, although the issue was solely and exclusively democracy against fascism and Nazism. Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian partisans and guerrillas, with their numerous banners, have repeatedly emphasized in all their proclamations the necessity of obtaining democratic rights. Their struggle has moved along these lines, always following the same course. They are fighting for a form of political organization whereby the people will have the exclusive right to decide their destiny. It should not be difficult for the American people who read their Declaration of Independence every Fourth of July to comprehend that the essence of Balkan political thought consists in a will to win the fundamental political freedom which has been obstructed either by corrupt domestic politics or by foreign powers. It is not difficult to imagine the discouragement the fighters of Yugoslavia and Greece must feel when they hear Allied broadcasts which fail to give to their struggle the meaning they give it every moment by their lives.

The attempt to solve the political problem in the Balkans has already been a failure. It remains to be seen how the military solution will be approached on the terrain itself when the liberation of the Balkans begins. The invasion may be launched through the classical route: Salonika and the Vardar Valley, where the roads are well known to the old fighters of World War I. But the fact that vast German forces are concentrating in Lombardia, north of the Po River, may switch the scene of major operations to the north Adriatic between Trieste and Ljubljana toward former Austro-Hungary, even though the terrain is very inconvenient and almost impassable. In that region, as well as toward Salonika, the Yugoslav patriots are prepared. They have made intermittent forays between Ljubljana and Trieste, where they have had the support of the local population. The latent revolutionary situation which exists in that district will be of great aid to the Allies, who, after the conquest of Trieste, will find themselves in the midst of friendly people. Partisan resistance in Slovenia is also well organized and very strong, while in Croatia Pavelich's hand is practically played out. The Croatian peasant masses gathered in the Croatian Peasant Party, having remained faithful to their leader, Dr. Vlatko Machek, are the chief factors for order and security in those parts of Yugoslavia. The democratic spirit and pro-Allied sentiment are extremely strong in Serbia, so that it is utterly impossible for the puppet General Nedich to succeed in stamping out the resistance of the Serbian masses against the German conquerors. No doubt the Nazis have strengthened their garrisons there.

In my native Dalmatia every valley and every island became a fastness of the people's resistance. This Slavic country has always felt that from the Adriatic to Vladivostok there extends an unbroken path of common spiritual and moral objectives. To the shores of Dalmatia, in 1918, American seamen had brought with them, among other things, Wilson's fourteen points, bread and faith in a better world. Even then, as children, we thought that the old world had died forever. At that time we were still under the deadly burden of the Hapsburg nightmare. In the company of American soldiers we jubilantly demolished the marble emblems of the Hapsburg regime—symbols of darkness and slavery. There was no AMG at that time. There ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

isted an unlimited faith in freedom and democracy and, above all, in their bearers, the Americans.

It is doubtful whether that faith exists today. In order to reëstablish it, it is of paramount importance to proclaim above all the principle of democracy. Alongside it, the principle of federalism. There is one principle upon which it is certain that all the Balkan peoples will agree. That is the principle of Balkan independence embodied in the sentence: "Balkans to the Balkan peoples." Therein lies the essence of their political survival. Thus far the Balkan people have been the victims of the clashing interests of the great powers, who have not permitted this principle of unity to materialize. The Balkan countries, therefore, have been deeply affected by all international crises. Each of the big powers has endeavored to find in individual Balkan states an ally for one political grouping or another. This policy has worked against the security of particular countries as well as against the balance of all the Balkan states. But Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania and even Turkey—if the Balkans were allowed to follow the course of common political interest—could create a Balkan commonwealth of free and independent nations. Such a commonwealth would be a natural link between the democratic West and Soviet Russia. Guerrillas in Yugoslavia and Greece have proclaimed to the Balkan nations that the struggle they are waging is for the independence of the Balkan nations and for full coöperation with Russia on one hand and the United States and Great Britain on the other. And just as the various guerrillas are struggling for the establishment of a pure and complete form of democratic government in their individual countries, they are also striving to create a community of Balkan nations.

The Balkan peoples have matured politically; their will and stamina in the struggle for the creation of a new world are unflinching. That world must be a world of freedom for each nation in a community of other free nations. Only in this manner can the Balkans await with confidence the moral and political regeneration which will emerge from this war. It will depend on the Allies and their readiness to shape their plans for the Balkans along these lines and apply them in full coöperation with the people's leaders at present on the field of battle. Should the Allies prove unwilling or reluctant to collaborate, the Balkans, quite naturally, would be compelled to focus all their hopes on the achievement of their democratic freedom through revolution.

BOGDAN RADITSA

# What Next in Italy?

PEOPLE IN AMERICA AND BRITAIN are asking what can be done to lead the Italians into war against the Germans. Soon the Italians might be asked to make street demonstrations for war, as they were asked in July to make street demonstrations for peace. Will Churchill and Roosevelt obtain Italian cannon fodder from Badoglio as Hitler had it from Mussolini?

For three years, British and American broadcasters have told the Italians that they would have peace were Mussolini no longer there. In March, 1943, the Italians started revolutionary strikes, and they went on raising as many disturbances as they could while Tunisia and then Sicily were attacked. At last, in July, Mussolini had become such a dead weight that he had to be dismissed by the King, and superseded by Badoglio. The American and British broadcasters then told the Italians that it was Badoglio who was to blame for not giving them that peace for which they were longing. The Italians stormed the streets of their cities protesting against him. At this moment, Allied airplanes bombed Milan, Turin and Genoa, mowing down and dispersing the crowds who were crying for peace. They might better have bombed the Brenner railway and prevented the Germans from pouring into Italy. Thus the Germans had plenty of time to entrench themselves in northern Italy while the revolutionary upsurge was stifled.

The Italians know that Mussolini, with the necessary connivance of the King, before, during and after all his crimes, has brought Italy to ruin. They spurn the army chiefs responsible for the military and moral disaster of Greece, East Africa, Libya, Tunisia and Sicily. They know that all the Fascist bigwigs' geese are cooked. They loathe Nazi domination in Italy. In July, they demonstrated not only for peace, but against the alliance with Nazi Germany, against the King, against Badoglio, against the Fascist regime, root and branch. They were machine-gunned by Badoglio, and bombed by American planes.

In addition they were told that the Allies revered the House of Savoy, and that Badoglio was liked by the American State Department as being "pro-American" and a "democrat." Then they were informed that the British and the Americans were "freezing" Fascist authority in Sicily. Now that same King who was responsible for the German treaty of alliance, instead of abdicating and making room for men who have no links with the past, and could without dishonor bring Italy back into the comity of self-respecting nations, clings to his throne as a drowning man clings to a straw. How could Italians be asked to go to war against Germany under the King who is responsible for all Italy's misfortunes? The King and Badoglio might be persuaded to fight against the Germans if they were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to receive a sufficient bribe. But the common man is neither a king nor a professional soldier. He is a plain, honest man. You can force him to go to war, and even to fight, by the threat of death, but then you do not need to ask whether, and how, he can be persuaded to do so. If he is to act as a man and not as a motor car or a horse, you have to provide him with some moral principles which are worth fighting and dying for.

The faith of the Italians has been deeply shattered by the confused American and British policies. If purposes are not made clear, and if moral confidence is not restored, we cannot expect the Italians willingly to fight and die for the cause of the United Nations.

GAETANO SALVEMINI

# Is Pegler Right?

THIS IS NOT "an answer" to Pegler; such answers have become as corny as Pegler himself. The fact that the labor movement is a human institution, subject to moral lapses as well as to its moments of inspiration, is a little too obvious to weave into tedious declamations, as labor skates and the academic defenders of labor are too prone to do.

Whatever your concern about Pegler's phobia toward the labor movement today, there is no escaping the fact that he did a useful job in blowing this racketeer thing out of the water. Since he made this splendid contribution, I rather think that Peg has taken to reading his own column religiously, has become captivated with his own courage, and thus has sloughed off into the state where he can seriously describe the Wagner Act as an enslaving statute, and refer contemptuously to social security as something demanded by the "foreign element" for the "unventuresome." Liberals and radicals who are supersensitive to attack, and labor skates with a few odds and ends on their consciences, perhaps can justify to themselves their hysteria about Pegler. Personally, I feel that the roots of the labor movement are deep in good soil, and that Pegler is not a fascist threat but just a problem in public relations for labor, which the movement has been slow and inept in solving.

So let's talk about racketeering and dishonesty. There are thieves and gangsters in the labor movement. (Read "labor movement" as AFL, for the reason that the CIO is not old enough to have this ailment.) There are not one-hundredth as many as a Pegler fan would assume, and there are no doubt more than President Green could be expected to admit. Any conclusion as to the probable percentage would be phony on its face, because much of the knavery cannot be known. The worst of the problem is solved, and what remains is tenacious because of the feudal structure of the AFL, a system whereby an international-union president can invoke his autonomous rights to protect a rotten condition in his union. The same situation carries on down to the local tsar, who can scare the pants off an international president, who must have the support of the local tsars to keep his job.

I rather think that a shortening of the lines of authority between the hierarchy of the AFL and the membership is desirable and inevitable, if the malpractice of labor fakers is to be brought to an irreducible minimum. It will be a long and difficult job, because it means that some favorite clichés must be scrapped. It will mean a less slavish devotion to the "democratic rights" which have been faked up to make the president of the AFL the puppet of international-union presidents, and the international-union presidents the puppets of the local tsars upon whom they depend for political support.

But to return to my thesis, that the problem is diminishing. Three years ago, I was at the 1940 convention of the AFL in New Orleans. In the lobby of the Roosevelt Hotel one evening I needled one of the king-makers on the executive board because of the hypocrisy of the AFL leaders on the gangster problem. This king-maker knew, as everyone else at the convention knew, that the machine-controlled convention would pass a pious bit of fakery denouncing gangsterism, and then reëlect George E. Browne of the stage hands' union to the executive council. The whole world knew that Browne had sold himself, body, soul and union, to the Capone gang in Chicago. My friend the king-maker finally became irritated with my needling, and snorted:

"I'll tell you why we're going to do it. We're just not going to admit that the newspapers are right."

Flash back to the present. Joseph V. Moreschi, president of the numerically powerful hod carriers and common laborers, an egregiously rotten union, is today buttonholing the bosses of the AFL to support him for membership on the executive council, a seat having been made vacant by the disgusted withdrawal of Harvey W. Brown and the International Association of Machinists. Three years ago Moreschi's voting strength in the AFL convention would have made friends and influenced people. He still has that strength, but in the past few weeks the top boys in the AFL, Dan Tobin of the teamsters among them, have fled Moreschi like a plague. He will not be a member of the executive council. O. K., so it isn't much. But it's some improvement over 1940.

In 1940, Dave Dubinsky reappeared in the AFL with his Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and marked his return by introducing the anti-gangster resolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.



Weak as that resolution was, it irritated Joe Fay, vice-president of the operating engineers. Fay, in his cups one night, slapped Dubinsky around the lobby of the Roosevelt, as a sort of minority report on the gangster resolution. Today Fay is under indictment with James Bove, vice-president of Moreschi's union, for shaking $700,000 out of the contractors on the Delaware water system in New York. It is not impossible that Dubinsky will get that executive council seat.

When I say that much of the problem has been cleared up, I refer to the invasion of international unions by professional gangsters. Two organizations in recent years were completely taken over by the Capone mob, the stage hands' and movie operators' union and the building service employees' union. Neither President Green nor any other members of the executive council distinguished themselves during this period. The federal government cracked control of the gang in the stage hands, when it stumbled on a payment of $100,000 to Willie Bioff in the income-tax records of Joe Schenck, the movie magnate.

Browne and Bioff were being convicted in the federal court in New York of a gigantic shakedown of the movie industry while the 1941 convention was in session in Seattle, and the convention sheepishly reduced the number of seats in the executive council, rather than openly replace Browne in the council with an honest man. The present international officers of the stage hands' and movie operators' union had guilty knowledge of the looting of their union by the Capone gang, as will be shown in the forthcoming trial of seven more members of the gang in New York in October. The members of this union are all sharp citizens, not dopes. If you asked them why they permit even the slightest remnants of the Browne administration to remain in office, I suppose they would attribute it to sheer human inertia and to the fact that the present officers seem to perform their duties reasonably well. Don't ask the hierarchy of the AFL about this. The stage hands and movie operators are "autonomous."

State prosecution in New York broke the gang hold on the building service employees' union with the conviction of George Scalise, its stooge president, who funneled the union's money to the Capone gang. Since the conviction of Scalise, the building service employees' union has been admirably conducted by President William McFetridge, who is cleaning out every trace of Capone influence, without, it must be regretfully announced, too much help or encouragement from the executive council of the AFL, whose members would probably just as soon forget the whole Scalise interlude.

My point in relating these cases is to observe that you don't need to amend the Wagner Act or any other law to reach labor crooks. A modernization of the structure of the AFL will do part of the job. And prosecutors like Assistant United States Attorney General Boris Kostelanetz of New York and New York County District Attorney Frank S. Hogan will do the rest of the job.

In a number of other unions, there have been flare-ups of racketeering and gangsterism on a lesser scale. Gangsters ruled the hotel and restaurant workers in New York for a time, but were settled by Tom Dewey. The Capone gang took over the bartenders' union in Chicago. Their nominal stooges were driven out by newspaper publicity and a court-conducted election, but their connection probably has not been completely severed. The international president of the hotel and restaurant workers (which includes the bartenders) is Edward Flore, a member of the executive council of the AFL, a lover of the status quo if ever there was one. He did nothing to block the control of the Capone gang in Chicago, probably out of sheer ineptitude. Gangsters have also appeared in control of locals in this union in Miami. In contrast, the Detroit locals of this union, run by a rigorously honest and dour German named Louie Koenig, are models of honest and democratic trade unionism.

The painters' and the bill posters' unions, within my memory, have had sporadic local outbreaks of gangsterism, but it would be decidedly unfair to classify them as gangster-infested. Joe Ryan's International Longshoremen's Association has produced an assortment of petty racketeering and shakedowns by the local padrones of the waterfront. And the smoke that comes from the grand jury when Joe Fay is on the program indicates that some activities of the operating engineers are not wholly kosher.

I have omitted the building trades, because here you find a peculiar situation in which the business agent works with the boss, and it is difficult to determine where and when ordinary, uneconomic collusion ends and bribery begins. In many instances, building-trade unions get their "conditions" by acting as a partner of contractors' associations or building-material manufacturers in monopolistic practices. They can and do prevent "outside" contractors from doing business. They can and do, through their political power in the big cities, police building codes to protect the standard materials against competition. The lather's vested interest in lath is no less than that of a lath manufacturers' association. The business agent who is the link between the worker and the contractor has many opportunities for graft. It would be fatuous either to say that they are all honest or are all crooks.

One more situation. During the cantonment-building period, the carpenters and the hod carriers, who furnished the bulk of the workers, reaped a harvest in initiation fees. Both international unions imposed reasonable maximums on their locals in the lush days of 1940 and 1941, it must be granted. And a case can be made for initiation fees. The union represents a difference perhaps between $1.25 and 50 cents an hour.

But frequently on cantonment jobs there was a racket

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in operation between business agents and foremen to work a man only until his union initiation fee had been paid and then replace him with a new man. The Truman Committee of the Senate found enough evidence of this racket to indicate that local bosses of carpenter and laborer unions created bitterer enemies of the labor movement than ever Pegler did. This is another instance of how "autonomy" works.

Where do we stand now? Browne, Bioff and Scalise are in prison. Seven other members of the Capone gang go to trial in New York October 4. Two international vice-presidents are under indictment for extortion. This is good evidence, not bad. True, the AFL leaders themselves did nothing to bring this about, but remember the king-maker who wanted George Browne reëlected because he didn't want to admit that the newspapers were right. Psychologically, many AFL leaders are still meeting in the back room of a saloon, with the whole world their enemy. That defensive complex, as well as the anarchic concept of "democratic rights" allowed the racketeer problem to assume the proportions that it did in the heyday of the Capone gang.

There is no defense either for racketeering or the timidity and political venality of leaders who wring their hands and prate about the "autonomous rights" of either international presidents or local tsars. But we have been talking about a small number of unions, and a small number of men within those unions. I repeat my belief that the roots of the labor movement are planted deep in good soil, and that a handful of mischievous men will not prevail against them.

*Washington* EDWIN A. LAHEY

# Wheeler of Montana

In October, 1941, Sen. Burton Kendall Wheeler of Montana, the accepted leader of the isolationist bloc, announced:

> If and when this country goes to war in the manner provided in the Constitution, by declaration of Congress, everything I do and every word I utter will be for the successful prosecution of that war. As soon as the declaration were made, I would stump this country from one end to the other to urge the people to stand together for victory.

Two months after that ringing announcement, this country went to war in the Senator's prescribed manner, after having been treacherously attacked by the country of whom Wheeler had said: "Japan is one of our best customers. I see no reason why we cannot live at peace with her." In the subsequent twenty months, needless to say, the Senator has not worn himself out stumping the country for unity.

Instead, he has confined his activities almost exclusively to doing a number of things that seem questionable contributions to victory. He has, for example, done his best to shift the nation's strategy from war on Hitler to war on Japan. In The New York Times Magazine for June 6, 1943, he pleaded that we should attack Japan because she is strong enough to threaten us while Germany is not. He wrote:

> For apparently we have no assurance that should the war against Hitler end first, Russia would feel called upon to fight Japan, and England might then be so involved in preventing a post-war upheaval in Europe, following the defeat of Hitler, as to render her unable to come to our aid in a substantial way in the Pacific.

For a man who feels we have so many enemies and no friends, Senator Wheeler has never shown any great anxiety about the state of our armed forces. On eleven chief national-defense measures before Pearl Harbor, he voted eleven times "Nay." His most outspoken campaign since Pearl Harbor has been to defer fathers, despite the statements of Secretary Stimson and General Hershey that doing so would immeasurably hamper the army and lengthen the war. Early this year he proposed an amendment to that effect (managing in the course of the debate, incidentally, to give what should have been invaluable information to the enemy about the number of men we expected to ship abroad this year), and when Selective Service, with its pool of single and childless married men exhausted, ordered the drafting of fathers, Wheeler demanded that Senator Barkley reconvene Congress to pass his amendment. Finally, his most recent act was a letter to the President supporting the Pope's demand for a negotiated peace.

Nor has Wheeler's record on home-front measures been exactly conducive to the prosecution of the war. He voted against any move to prevent inflation; voted to limit the NLRB, the NYA, the NRPB, the CCC and the OWI (the last with the statement that it would be a blessing to the country if the OWI were eliminated entirely).

Wheeler's principal effort on the home front, in fact, has been hardly conducive to morale, except possibly Nazi morale. He was the loudest voice against the trial of the thirty-three tinhorn fascists and crackpots on the charge of sedition and conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces, and is credited by The Times with having personally forced Attorney General Biddle to replace the very effective prosecutor, William Powers Maloney, with O. John Rogge, who although perhaps equally competent, required so long to familiarize himself with the case that the defendants are not likely to stand trial before 1944, if at all.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The amazing thing about this record of defeatism and resistance of the war effort is Wheeler's persistent reputation as a liberal. What is his record? First, there is the sympathetic personal story: the struggles of the poor boy to get an education, the quiet, unassuming life he leads with a folksy wife and six clean-cut American children, the breezy, open Western mannerisms, etc. All of that contributes to the general picture of a man who could never get far away from his origins—honest old Burt Wheeler, the peepul's friend. But his liberal reputation is a lot more than that. It is the legend that since Wheeler entered politics in 1910 he has been consistently and wholeheartedly fighting the "interests." Supporters carefully point out, for example, that Wheeler was fighting for the "liberal" cause in the West while Roosevelt was "hobnobbing with reactionaries" in New York and that Wheeler ran for Vice President on La Follette's Progressive ticket when Roosevelt was backing John W. Davis, a Morgan lawyer.

A.M.

Wheeler's "liberal" record makes a convincing case. He fought the power of Anaconda Copper in his home state; he was a progressive United States Attorney for the Montana district during the last war, refusing to prosecute radicals and pacifists; he was one of the loudest crusaders in the Teapot Dome investigation (in fact, he was the model for James Stewart in the movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington"); he was an active member and leader of the Senate minority, the "opposition," from his first election in 1922 until Roosevelt took office; he was the first Senator to come out for Roosevelt and had been making Roosevelt-for-President speeches as far back as 1930; he spent most of the four years from 1935 to 1939 in a muckraking investigation of the railroads; in fact, until 1937, when he led the fight against the President's Supreme Court reform bill and Roosevelt called him a "reactionary," *there had never been any public attack on Wheeler's liberalism.*

That, then, is the myth. Until the Court fight in 1937, Wheeler was a flawless little gem of liberalism, and then suddenly something "happened" to him, and every version of just what happened differs. Unfortunately, this pretty story does not stand up to analysis. In 1935 there was a very significant incident, later reported by Ambassador Dodd in his "Diary." Dodd described a dinner at Rexford Tugwell's, where he met "a certain well known Senator." The Senator attacked Roosevelt all evening, particularly for not having agreed with the Progressive group on huge appropriations, and claimed that he and Huey Long had brought about Roosevelt's nomination in 1932. Dodd continues:

> The attitudes of this man were amazing. He talks like a National Socialist. He would stop trade with Europe. He advocated German domination of all Europe, our domination of the Americas, and Japanese domination of the Far East. He wishes to see England dominated by Germany, with Canada falling naturally to the United States. . . . But the Senator must have been sincere when he said he had persuaded Long to vote against the World Court idea about which Long knew nothing. I remarked at a quiet moment that I would not speak to Long. He said, "We shall soon be shooting up people here, like Hitler does."

Then for the pay-off. A week later Dodd had lunch with the President, and repeated in confidence several of the Senator's statements, without revealing the Senator's name. Roosevelt said immediately: "It sounds like Senator X." Dodd did not tell him that he had guessed right. On January 31, 1941, the President announced publicly that Dodd's "Senator X" was Wheeler. Wheeler immediately issued an indignant statement denying everything, but later that evening on the radio William E. Dodd Jr., who had edited the diary with his sister Martha, announced that Wheeler's name was in the original manuscript, and that he and his sister had changed it to "Senator X."

Thus the "liberal until 1937" story begins to fall apart. But that is only a small part of the record. As far back as 1922, when he first got into national politics, Wheeler evidently made his peace with Anaconda in Montana, and although he still makes a great fuss about being "hated" by the company, it has been twenty years since he did more than huff and puff at it occasionally. In fact, by 1940 he had come so far that he was voting in the Senate for a tax on foreign copper. Moreover, for years before the court fight, Wheeler was the darling of every crackpot panacea movement in the country, from the inflationists to Dr. Townsend (who loved Wheeler only slightly less than he loved his chief favorite, the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith).

Soon other things turned up that were difficult to explain away. In 1938, Wheeler chose Jacob Thorkelson as his candidate for Representative from Montana to beat his old enemy, Jerry O'Connell. For the next two years Thorkelson delivered the most rabidly anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi speeches ever heard on the floor of the House (no mean distinction), which were then appropriately collected by William Dudley Pelley in a folder called "The Invisible Government." Wheeler's friends pleaded that he hadn't known Thorkelson was a crude pro-Nazi Jew-baiter when he supported him, but as Wheeler moved from one display of anti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Semitism to another, the explanation became less and less convincing.

One of the most amazing defenses of Wheeler against the charge of anti-Semitism was made by his friend and fellow isolationist Frank C. Hanighen in Common Sense in late 1940. It began by admitting that Wheeler was "angry" at the Jews, but angry "just as a lawyer is angry with clients who are spoiling the case which he knows he'll one day have to plead." The moral was that Wheeler knew that after the war ended the Jews would be blamed for starting it, because all Jews were "interventionists." Wheeler, who as a man of good will would then go out and fight for them, was furious at the Jews because some of them weren't "isolationists," to make his case easier.

In March, 1941, Wheeler attacked the "warmongering international bankers" and named three: the Houses of Sassoon, Rothschild and Warburg—all Jewish—omitting the traditional "Aryan" firm of J. P. Morgan. Wheeler's defense when the newspapers charged anti-Semitism was as inspired as Hanighen's had been. "Frankly," he said, "I didn't know the Sassoons were Jews. The only one I ever saw was in China and he had on a native costume. I thought he was Chinese." Wheeler also spent a good part of that year on the congressional investigation of warmongering in the movies, a campaign that stayed as consistently anti-Semitic as an editorial in Der Stürmer.

By far the most damaging evidence against Wheeler, however, is the record of his association with and friendship for American fascists, told in John Roy Carlson's "Under Cover." Here are a few of the many examples of Wheeler's activities, according to Carlson:

Carlson found Colonel Sanctuary in high spirits, just returning from Washington. "It was Sunday but Senator Wheeler was waiting for me in his office," he said, "and we talked for forty-five minutes. The Senator certainly knows what's going on."

Donald Shea, director of the National Gentile League, came to the Plaza Hotel with a bagful of Senator Wheeler's speeches, sealed in franked envelopes, ready for mailing, and distributed them freely. Privately he spoke to Carlson of "necktie parties" for congressmen who voted for Lend-Lease.

Lawrence Dennis claimed credit for having persuaded Wheeler and Nye to attack the Department of Justice prosecutions of the thirty-three seditionists. Dennis' estimate of them: "Nye is the best of them all in Washington. And he is nearest to knowing what it's all about. Wheeler is a good fellow, but he can't stand up to Nye." When Dennis was coming up before the Army Exclusion Board, which was attempting to have him removed from the Eastern states, he told Carlson: "I didn't tell Fish about it, but I told Nye and Wheeler as soon as I was called. Wheeler saw the Assistant Secretary of War about it."

Senator Wheeler was too busy to see Carlson, his secretary said. That is, he was too busy until Carlson uttered the magic words: "I am a friend of Lawrence Dennis." The secretary smiled and typed it on a slip of paper, along with his name and address. Senator Wheeler kept another caller waiting while he received him briefly. When Carlson asked his opinion of the indicted men and women he dismissed the query with: "All these men are guilty of is anti-Semitism." . . . On leaving he told Wheeler that Dennis expected to be in Washington soon. "Fine. That is fine," Wheeler said.

The crucial question, obviously, is what could bring a man with a tradition of Western progressivism and a national reputation as a liberal to Wheeler's present position? There are a number of possible or partial explanations. For one, there is the dubiousness and ambiguity inherent in Western progressivism itself. Rooted in the small farmers and lacking a labor base, it has shown itself capable of turning into the bitterest isolationism and reaction as well as into Henry Wallace's kind of liberalism.

More specifically, one of the principal reasons for Wheeler's shift has been frank careerism. He does not come up for reëlection until 1946, and can safely count on the war's being over by then and a probable wave of reaction and anti-war revulsion that might make him a hero. More ambitiously, the same movement might possibly catapult him into the leadership of the Democratic Party and the presidency in 1948, or even perhaps 1944 if the war ends in time. Still more ambitiously, there is the good possibility of a third party, of the frank Nationalist Party that the Deatherages and the Pelleys shout about, but that men like Wheeler and Nye, Reynolds and Fish, are certainly considering with increasing seriousness every day.

In a surprisingly large number of cases, people who oppose the war go on from that to speaking well of the enemy and being hostile to labor, which is supporting the war. Such people, if they speak in public, find that their audiences increasingly consist of persons who are anti-Semitic and covertly pro-fascist. (Life Magazine reported in pre-Pearl Harbor days that when Wheeler spoke, his audiences booed any mention of Roosevelt or Britain but were silent when he attacked Hitler. Soon the Senator was deliberately pausing after his attacks on Roosevelt and the British, but slurred right into another subject after every crack at Hitler.)

It is undeniable that Wheeler today makes few public suggestions except those that are harmful to the war effort. He calls for a negotiated peace, a smaller army, a dangerous basic shift in strategy. It is undeniable that until the United States entered the war, at least, he felt a German victory would be no great calamity. It is undeniable that he is against the Jews, and that he is extraordinarily patient, to say the least, with American fascists and proto-fascists. What does that make Senator Wheeler? You name it.

POTOMACUS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Washington Notes

## The Puzzle of Mr. Roosevelt

MR. ROOSEVELT is sometimes superior and condescending at his press conferences. He has lashed out recently at two columnists who were friendly to him. He finds himself supported in certain debatable foreign policies by, of all people, Arthur Krock. He has kept Jesse Jones and dismissed Henry Wallace; kept Cordell Hull and let Sumner Welles go. Furthermore, he has not raised a banner of specific post-war reforms to which men of good will could repair. America is aroused, and winning stirring victories, but we still do not know for certain whether Mr. Roosevelt is fighting for negative or positive ends.

We in Washington who see Mr. Roosevelt from week to week ponder these things. Furthermore, for the past fortnight or so Winston Churchill has been with us. Those who listened to a memorable off-the-record conference with the Prime Minister were struck again by the extraordinary power and ascendancy of the man, his courage, faith, resolve, his self-confidence and charm—and his formidable determination to preserve the Empire: India, Hong Kong, Singapore. Churchill, as Harold Laski points out, symbolizes in amazing fashion the British will-to-survive. But, declares Laski, he is "uninterested in the social implications of the struggle."

When Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill switches on the charm, they are irresistible. One wonders what can possibly happen when they are alone and operating in the same room. This is said sincerely, and with genuine curiosity. Which dominates the other? Maybe the matter does not take that turn. Their backgrounds of good breeding, comfortable living and *noblesse oblige* are not dissimilar. They are both strong men. If Churchill has a bulldog face, Roosevelt has a Dutch jaw. Mr. Roosevelt has shown greater awareness of social implications in the past. He has felt the weight of the full reactionary attack. For the time being, the American President seems to accept the Churchill thesis that the big job is to win the war, and that to find out what it is all about comes afterwards.

The above-mentioned facets in Mr. Roosevelt's character, and his alleged shortcomings, have led many liberals recently to shake their heads sadly. There is mention, too, of Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet. He is a bad administrator; most of the Hull-Welles row, and the Jones-Wallace row, he brought on himself; furthermore, he is too tenderhearted to throw out misfits. Look at his department heads! Will it be said some day that when Mr. Roosevelt took office the Nine Old Men were in the Supreme Court; and when he left they were in his Cabinet?

President Roosevelt, White House circles say, was especially disturbed about the Drew Pearson statements because he was afraid that the Russians might think Drew had obtained them from Sumner Welles. He believes that the record to date fully justifies the Darlan policy—and the Badoglio policy as well. He and his defenders say that the Welles-Hull quarrel has been oversimplified by some of the liberals; that it is a complicated matter, and most of all one involving a clash of personalities rather than one of fundamental national policies.

The Roosevelt defenders say that in regard to North Africa, Italy and even things here in Washington, the critics are talking out of inadequate knowledge. They report that some of the necessary information still comes under the head of restricted military information, and perhaps it will for a long time. But when the facts are known, his supporters say, the picture will be different.

It is also possible that all these matters will be regarded as water over the dam, and comparatively unimportant. Nothing succeeds like success; if Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, plus Mr. Stalin and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, win the war, as now seems overwhelmingly probable, few will want to go back and argue about the rights and wrongs of the Darlan affair or the treatment of de Gaulle.

Nevertheless, Mr. Roosevelt's present swing to the right has deeply exercised many New Dealers here in Washington. From time to time, one hears one of them say that he is about ready to pin his hopes on Mr. Willkie instead of the President. One hardly knows how seriously to take this talk: Washington is always full of sensational ultra-pessimistic tabletalk which no one takes at its face value, least of all the man who says it. In any case, the election is still a long way off; it is too early to make predictions about it, and still less, to go out on a limb yourself. In thinking of any future President, you must remember not only the man himself, but the forces by whom he will be surrounded while in the White House, and his probable ability to cope with such forces. Mr. Roosevelt, at worst, would be surrounded as he pretty much is today, with Southern conservative politicians. Mr. Willkie, at worst, would be surrounded by the spokesmen for big business.

Most of the liberals whom I know remember, or will remember before November of next year, that after all, Mr. Roosevelt is the ablest politician in the country; that he has done more for social reform than any President since Lincoln; that he is perfectly capable, once the war is over, of turning again to the New Deal and, in a couple of weeks' time, of wiping out the memory of the war period with a series of slashing proposals, supported by the fireside chats of which he is such a master.

The liberals who would throw Mr. Roosevelt aside ought to take a look at Congress. Compared with the average member of either house, Mr. Roosevelt, even in the middle of the war, seems a model of liberalism. He seems that, too, to the members of Congress themselves, many of whom appear to have come back to Washington thirsting for blood. If their contact with their constituents made them any more progressive in attitude, conversations with the earliest arrivals don't seem to show it.

Henry Wallace is as good a liberal as the country possesses. He has had more reason to be unhappy about the President than anybody else; yet he continues to stick to him. In fact, only the other day he nominated Mr. Roosevelt for permanent chairman of the Peace Conference, on the evident hypothesis that the conference would last a long time and perhaps turn into a pretty permanent organization. There are a good many liberals, here in Washington, who feel that if Mr. Roosevelt is good enough for Henry Wallace, he is still good enough for them.

*Washington* T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Short and Happy

SOME of the best movies of the year are seven-minute cartoons called by names like "All This and Rabbit Stew" or "The Fighting 69th ½," which come on as unheralded transitions in the double bill and feature the notorious Bugs Bunny, a rabbit that not only performs physical feats of a Paul Bunyan magnitude but is equally sharp with his mind. They come from Warner Brothers, are produced by Leon Schlesinger and are called "Merrie Melodies"; ten of them are being reissued this fall, still as "Merrie Melodies" but with the addition of a Blue Ribbon.

One reason for the brightness of "Merrie Melodies," and for their superiority over fellow travelers in the field, is that Schlesinger is out to make you laugh, bluntly, and as it turns out, cold-bloodedly. This runs him against the grain of the several well worked grooves down which the animated cartoon has traveled under the belief that these grooves will never wear through. However, it no longer seems funny to see animals who talk and act like human beings, who do all sorts of ingenious tricks—most of them superhuman—who go through lives of the highest excitement and reward, but have no inner, or mental, life. The complex emotional life and three-dimensional nature of the Schlesinger characters allow their makers to poke fun at everything in sight, or out of sight—especially if it is something familiar and well loved, like "Hiawatha," a kind person, or any bad actress' great moments. It is an illusion of most cartoon makers that they must have a moral, or do good, if it means only killing the villain; Schlesinger is not under this illusion. The masterpiece, "Inki and the Lion," is also a masterpiece of amorality—so far the other side of goodness that it is a parody of "Bambi." In this version of forest life Man is the likable spear-thrower, preyed on by animals, and the king of the Forest is a supernatural horror called the Mina bird, who hates man and beast alike.

The artistic method in Schlesinger cartoons is neither in Disney's top drawer (at his best) nor Popeye's bottom one, but even so it has gone off at a tangent lately that may open up new paths to the cartoon method. It is a change from the straight, insipid realism to a sophisticated shorthand, made up of flat, stylized, posterlike representations, using a sort of Persian color of fancy tones like dusty pink. It is a much simpler style of cartoon drawing, the animation is less profuse, the details fewer, and it allows for reaching the joke and accenting it much more quickly and directly: it also gets the form out of the impossible dilemma between realism and wacky humor.

The goal in Schlesinger heroes is a comic figure with a temperament and behavior as peculiarly his own as those of a Chaplin or a W. C. Fields, which goal is never achieved; but it leads to several rewards, like the Mina bird, who appears in the "Inki" (little African boy) series. The Mina bird is like a toucan, shaped like an acorn, coal black, who moves inscrutably in an atmosphere of overwhelming supernaturalism, to the tune of Mendelssohn's overture to "Fingal's Cave." At the end of each musical phrase he gives one prodigious, syncopated hop, thereafter moving forward indomitably. The Mina bird is inevitably followed by a passive three-year-old individual named Inki, who loves to throw spears, and by a lion (the lion is Schlesinger's most unsuccessful creation—he looks like Robinson Crusoe). The famous Bugs Bunny is Schlesinger's one-animal advertisement of the moral that unadulterated torturing of your fellow men pays off.

At the 26-issues-per-year rate at which they are thought up, the "Merrie Melodies" are bound to vary greatly in quality. The surprising facts about them are that the good ones ("The Case of the Missing Hare," "Hiawatha's Rabbit Hunt," "Inki and the Lion") are masterpieces and the bad ones aren't a total loss. For instance, the poor "Rabbit Who Came to Dinner" is given a tremendous lift when in the midst of the inevitable and tedious chase of the rabbit by Elmer, the clock strikes twelve and Bugs breaks into one of his typical emotional upsets, roaring out "Auld Lang Syne," kissing Elmer, flinging confetti in the age-old tradition of New Year's Eve—Elmer being as easily diverted in July as in any other month.

Schlesinger is in the Sennett tradition, which uses the whole sphere of man's emotion and behavior simply as a butt for humor, no matter what it leads to. The aim is purely and simply laughter. Schlesinger's men are rich and inventive humorists, and their smart-alecky freshness has turned what is meant to be an interval on the program into the moment when the whole audience brightens up.

MANNY FARBER

# Science and Technology

NATIVES OF INDIA are not at present allowed to become citizens of the United States—a handicap which they share with the Chinese and other Orientals. They are permitted to enter this country only under special conditions, with great difficulty and constant insecurity regarding their tenure. Apparently our government believes that Indians are inferior to Albanians, Turks, Armenians and many other races which are permitted free access and free citizenship.

This country does not, however, scorn to take advantage of the numerous and important inventions and discoveries of Indian scientists, whether resident in this country or in India. These inventions and discoveries are playing a valuable part in helping to win the war.

For example: our troops have been greatly aided by the invention of "unbreakable containers" in which even liquids can be dropped from airplanes upon hard ground without being shattered. These containers are the work of Prof. Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar, director of the recently established All India Board of Scientific and Industrial Research. Sir Shanti is also the inventor of a widely used stove hardly larger than a matchbox, which gives off intense heat for twelve hours from a single filling of solid fuel. He has produced fabrics and other materials resistant to poisonous gases, and cotton cloth with the insulating properties and the warmth of wool.

In these days when food is scarce, there is great importance in a new process which preserves cantaloupes almost perfectly while being stored or shipped. This is the work of Dr. Jagan Nath Sharma, an Indian chemist who lives in Los Angeles. Another of Dr. Sharma's processes artificially colors oranges without harm to the fruit, and has increased the annual income of Florida growers, on good but dull-looking oranges, by $45,000,000. He has done important work on other vegetables and fruits as well.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The deadly new flame-throwers that the American army used against the Japanese before Munda have undoubtedly benefited from the work of another Indian in America, Dr. Alamjit D. Singh, of the University of Illinois. He has also made important contributions to camouflage. This subject has likewise received attention from an Indian chemist of Detroit, K. N. Kathju, who has collaborated with Hexter and Shepheard in developing green and other paints that cannot be told from surrounding vegetation even under infra-red photography.

American and British soldiers in the jungles of Burma are endangered by the very serious fever known as *kala azar*. For its treatment we are indebted to another Indian, Sir Upendranath Brahamachari.

The proportion of distinguished scientists among educated men in India is exceptionally high, probably because the situation of India under British rule makes other outstanding careers abnormally difficult. The proportion of scientists among Indians in the United States is still higher. In relation to their total numbers, Indian scientists outnumber British ones here by sixteen to one; French, twenty-six to one; Germans, thirty-six to one; Spaniards, seventy to one.

In a brief article such as this, one can mention only a few of the Indian scientists in America and their researches. Dr. V. R. Kokutnur is making important contributions to chemical warfare; Dr. Beram D. Saklatwalla is working in metal technology. Dr. Sharat Kumar Roy, Dr. Yellapragada Subarrow, Prof. Subramanyam Chandrasekhar and many more are all doing valuable work.

Some of the Indians in India who have engaged in scientific research have won worldwide renown. One thinks of Sir Jagdish Chandra Bose, Sir P. C. Ray, Sir C. V. Raman, S. Ramanujan, Prof. M. N. Saha, Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis, Sir Ramnath Chopra. The notion that men like these are unfit for American citizenship that is freely granted to the most backward and ignorant Balkan peasant is so absurd that it needs no comment.

# The Bandwagon

Russia is constantly demanding from the United Nations and giving little in return. – *From David Lawrence's syndicated column of August 13, 1943.*

As far as I have seen, Americans have been good about not looting. Usually they take only what is left from the Germans' and Italians' destruction or what the inhabitants voluntarily give them. All I could salvage were a few pieces of lace from the baroness' sewing room floor. – *Ernie Pyle's report from Sicily, printed in The Louisville Courier-Journal.*

A sterling silver service is a symbol of stability in a child's world. – *From an advertisement in The New Yorker.*

### Signs and Portents

The Germans have notified the Swedish stone industry to halt the quarrying of granite which they had ordered for the post-war construction of German victory monuments and official Nazi buildings. – *AP dispatch to The New York Herald Tribune.*

### Red?

Oliver Clandorf, sixty, agreed with prosecution witnesses today that business "improved considerably" after he became operator of the Hermitage Hotel, Seventh Avenue and Forty-second Street. But, he insisted from the witness stand in Special Sessions Court, the improvement was not, as prosecution witnesses charged, due to his maintenance of the hotel as a house of prostitution.

"It was because I hung out four neon signs and painted the hallway," he said. – *From The New York Post.*

### Or Something

The Russian Army is very much stronger since it abolished the commissars and restored the salute to officers. – *From an editorial in The New York Daily News*

*Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.* – THE EDITORS

# Correspondence

## Willkie's Popularity

SIR: I regret to see The New Republic engaged in a spite flirtation with Wendell Willkie. Spite flirtations are rarely effectual, always dangerous, and sometimes disastrous to all concerned.

I am glad, however, that The New Republic is not carrying the affair to disgusting extremes of indecency indulged in by The Nation and PM.

In my opinion you appraise Willkie generously when you say of him that he has "a peculiar facility in using fair words to advance foul deeds."

Willkie's popularity is chiefly ascribable to the stunt he puts on of a Republican imitating Roosevelt. It isn't a very good imitation, but as Samuel Johnson said of a woman's preaching, it is "like a dog walking on his hind legs. It is not done well, but you are surprised to find it done at all."

*Remsen, N. J.* AUGUSTUS RICHARDS

## Catholics and Liberals

SIR: Gaetano Salvemini's letter on "Catholics and Liberals," in The New Republic of August 2, 1943, is unprecise and misleading. It fails to distinguish between two fundamental concepts, and it asserts a cleavage between Catholics and liberals which is unrealistic.

"The dignity of the individual soul" may be understood in either a natural or a supernatural sense. The *natural* dignity of the soul is equivalent to the dignity of personality. It means that the human person has intrinsic worth, in Kant's fine phrase, is "an end in himself," not a mere means to any other end, nor a mere instrument to any other person or combination of persons. The central idea in all these phrases can be most concretely expressed in the statement that the human person has natural rights; that is, rights which are born in him, which are not derived from the state or from society and which exist primarily for his own welfare. These rights are equal in all persons, without exception or reservation on account of race, color, creed or economic condition.

This concept of human dignity automatically excludes the principles and assumptions of totalitarianism. It is what most men have in mind when they assert the dignity of personality or the dignity of the soul. As proclaimed by the Catholic Church,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it forms the basis, not of a "rift," as Professor Salvemini intimates, but of agreement between Catholics and genuine liberals.

It was said above that the natural dignity of the soul is "equivalent" to the dignity of personality. If we substitute for "equivalent to," the words "the basis of" we shall have a more exact expression. If the human person be not infused and endowed with a spiritual and immortal soul he has no more moral dignity nor intrinsic worth than a horse, a cow or an elephant. The man who denies the existence of this kind of soul cannot logically assert the dignity of the soul or the dignity of personality; nor can he reject the pretensions of the totalitarian state.

The *supernatural* dignity of the soul is something else entirely. Inasmuch as all men are called to the supernatural order, all possess *potential* supernatural dignity, regardless of their actions or omissions. Only those have *actual* supernatural dignity who have been elevated to the supernatural order through the sacrament of Baptism. They become "new creatures," "participants in the divine nature," "adopted children of God." All these Scriptural expressions designate a new and higher relation between the soul and God. In the language of Catholic theology, the soul which stands in this relation to God is in the "state of grace."

This elevated relation, this endowment of sanctifying grace, is what gives to the soul its supernatural dignity. This grace, this dignity, is conferred upon all persons who receive the sacrament of Baptism, whether they be Catholics or non-Catholics. It continues to inhere in all baptized persons until it is lost through mortal sin. Hence it is forfeited not only by the man who "does not conform to the teaching of the Catholic Church" (Salvemini) but by Catholics themselves, when they sin grievously. Catholics can *recover* this supernatural dignity of the soul through the sacrament of Penance; baptized non-Catholics, through repentance and acceptance of the Catholic faith. Non-Catholics who are below the age of reason *acquire* supernatural dignity through Baptism alone; non-Catholics above that age normally acquire it only by entrance into the Catholic Church.

The immediately foregoing paragraph may seem like a distracting side trip into the field of theology. Nevertheless, it was necessary in order to test the accuracy of Professor Salvemini's assertion concerning the forfeiture of "dignity of soul" by those who reject the Catholic Church. To the majority of readers this sentence in his letter probably carries the implication that, according to Catholic doctrine, *no* non-Catholic possesses true dignity of soul. As I have shown above, this inference is completely false as regards *natural* dignity, and with respect to *supernatural* dignity, it is subject to important qualifications. Even to the extent that it is true, its essential meaning is that deliberate refusal to accept Catholic teaching deprives the soul of sanctifying grace. To call this deprivation a loss or lack of "dignity of soul," adds nothing to the objective situation; to refrain from this language subtracts nothing. A Catholic who hears it for the first time may accept it as an appropriate characterization, but he will not therefore feel constrained to lower his estimation of non-Catholics. "Loss of dignity of soul" is not an objective or scientific definition; it designates no specific entity; it is only a more or less convenient descriptive phrase. Like other appropriate epithets it can be used invidiously.

"The Catholic doctrine teaches . . . that the secular government ought to prohibit the spreading of all doctrines condemned by the Catholic Church as endangering the dignity of the individual soul." This assertion of Professor Salvemini is quite as inaccurate and misleading as the one discussed in the foregoing paragraphs. The Catholic doctrine does not specify or imply that such a prohibition should be enacted by the secular governments of France, Great Britain or the United States. In general, doctrines condemned by the Church should be proscribed by secular governments when and to the extent that this policy is conducive to civil order and the common good. This application of it to moral theories, doctrines and situations encounters plenty of practical difficulties, *e.g.*, in the matter of birth control, but the principle itself meets with little objection when restricted to the field of morals. The prohibition of the propagation of erroneous religious doctrines stands on a different footing. According to the accepted Catholic teaching, the civil government is obliged to adopt and enforce this policy only in "Catholic states." As authoritatively defined, "a Catholic state" is not one whose membership is Catholic by a simple majority, or even by a great majority, but one whose members are *entirely* or *almost entirely* Catholic. (See Ryan and Boland, "Catholic Principles of Politics," pp. 319, 320). A very great majority of the citizens of Eire are Catholics, yet the Irish constitution and government assure to the non-Catholic minority, full freedom not only to worship but to "spread their doctrines." Neither the Papal Nuncio in Dublin, nor any Irish bishop nor any Roman authority has ever condemned this article of the Irish constitution or this policy of the Irish government.

Indeed, high authorities in the field of Canon Law and Moral Theology have expressed doubt that there now exists a single Catholic state in the technical sense.

Since the foregoing description, and not the summary assertion of Professor Salvemini, presents the Catholic doctrine, his fear of a "permanent rift between Catholics and liberals" seems to be without substantial foundation. To be sure, such cleavage does exist and must continue to exist between Catholic doctrine and certain forms of liberalism, *e. g.*, in the domains of philosophy and religion. But it need not be introduced into the fields of economics or politics. And I assume that these are the spheres alluded to by Professor Salvemini.

Presumably he and his liberal friends are in favor of those measures of economic and social reform which were enacted by Congress in the last ten years. Presumably, they are opposed to all the forms of political totalitarianism. Catholic doctrine permits and authorizes Catholics to pursue these objectives and normally to coöperate with liberals in this course. Obviously, Catholics cannot do so when their coöperation is utilized by liberals to promote ends or causes which are contrary to Catholic principles. An analogous situation was created for those innocent persons who joined the American League for Peace and Democracy, and who did not know that its policies were dominated by the Communists in the interest of their own party and ideology. On the other hand, liberals would be justified in refusing to coöperate with Catholics for social, economic or political reforms if the latter diverted the coöperation to the promotion of their own religious interests. In all three cases, the coöperation would lack straightforwardness.

Professor Salvemini is right in declaring that Catholics look upon the doctrines condemned by their Church as "endangering the dignity of the individual soul," but they also regard these doctrines as harmful and false. This is a clearer and more fundamental way of putting the matter than by stressing the term "dignity."

Undoubtedly the Professor is stating a fact when he implies that "many, too many, Catholics . . . indulge in reactionary activities," but when he intimates that this fact would justify a "rift" between Catholics and liberals, his logic is difficult to follow. After all, the coöperation of progressive Catholics for the advancement of worthy political and economic causes ought to be welcomed for its own sake by all earnest liberals. To reject it because those who offer it have not yet been able to convert their reactionary co-religionists to the right attitude seems to be neither fair, nor reasonable, nor wise. In passing, I would say that I use the word "convert" advisedly and with a moral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

connotation; for most of the Catholic reactionaries, at least in the field of economics, are ignorant of or deliberately reject the principles or the clear implications of the social encyclicals promulgated by Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize the fact that I have served on many "mixed" committees for the promotion of social, economic and political reforms. From a few of them I withdrew, as soon as I found that they were being directed toward extraneous ends in which I did not believe. All of them included some persons who held religious, moral and social views with which I profoundly disagreed. Nevertheless, I did not find that this association exposed me to moral, religious or intellectual contamination. And I fail to see why the same experience should not come to any person of average ability and prudence who coöperates with his fellow Americans for the promotion of economic and social justice.

*Washington, D. C.* RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

SIR: In my letter to The New Republic, August 2, I stated that the Catholic doctrine teaches three principles: (1) the dignity of the human soul is to be respected; (2) the dignity of the human soul is forfeited by whoever does not conform to the teaching of the Catholic Church; and (3) the secular government has to prevent the spreading of doctrines contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church and therefore endangering the dignity of the human soul. I stated also that the liberal doctrine does not admit principles (2) and (3) and that therefore there is a permanent rift between Catholics and liberals.

Dr. McMahon in The New Republic of June 21, 1943, maintained that point (2) does not exist in the Catholic doctrine, and I insisted that that principle does exist. Now the Rev. Dr. Ryan teaches both Dr. McMahon and myself that the dignity of the human soul is twofold, natural and supernatural, and that the Catholic doctrine, while withholding the supernatural, does not withhold the natural dignity of the human soul from those who are not members of the Catholic Church. If so, Dr. McMahon was at least half wrong when he ignored the fact that the Catholic doctrine does not grant any supernatural dignity to non-Catholic souls, and I was at least half right in saying that the Catholic doctrine embodies point (2).

But, natural or supernatural, the fact remains that the liberal doctrine does not grant to Catholics any monopoly on the methods of preserving either the natural or the supernatural dignity of the human soul. Any man, be he Catholic, Protestant, Jew or Buddhist, if he is an honest man, is according to the liberal doctrine endowed with dignity of the soul either natural or supernatural. An atheist who does not mind about the supernatural dignity of his soul, if he is an honest man, is entitled to believe in the dignity of his own soul no less than those who are concerned with both natural and supernatural dignities.

On point (3) the Rev. Dr. Ryan tells us that according to Catholic doctrine the teaching of "moral" principles condemned by the Catholic Church should be proscribed by secular governments not only in Catholic but also in non-Catholic states; but the propagation of erroneous "religious" (I would say "dogmatic") doctrines has to be prohibited by the civil government only in Catholic states, that is, those "whose members are entirely or almost entirely Catholics."

On this ground also there is a permanent rift between Catholics and liberals. For instance, the liberal doctrine teaches that while the Catholics are entitled to hold that birth control from a moral standpoint is a "sin," they are not entitled to demand that the secular government prosecute as a "crime" the teaching of birth control by people who do not believe that birth control is a "sin." As for "dogmatic" doctrines, I insist that according to the liberal doctrine anyone is entitled to go to heaven or to hell the way he chooses and no civil government should interfere with the religious beliefs or with the right to spread his religious beliefs of even a single person, even in a country where the unanimity minus one were consistently Catholic.

I agree with the Rev. Dr. Ryan that there are economic, social or political matters on which Catholics who are not reactionary and liberals may join hands, and that common action among them is desirable. But such common action and some partial coincidences which do exist between the Catholic and the liberal doctrines should never obscure the fact that the two doctrines contradict each other on the essential principles of the liberal doctrine.

I beg to remind the readers of The New Republic that I am not arguing that the liberal doctrine is right and the Catholic doctrine wrong. I am maintaining that the two doctrines do not coincide. This fact has to be emphasized at the moment when the world swarms with "liberals" who understand all principles but have none [of their own] and are always prepared to agree with whoever disagrees with them. I do not know whether the Rev. Dr. Ryan terms them "genuine" liberals. But this I know, that they are not "genuine" but brainless, spineless and cowardly pseudo-liberals.

*Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.* G. SALVEMINI

## *From The New Republic Mail Bag*

Because his proofs were delayed in the mail, one or two uncorrected errors occurred in the article by Charlton Smith, "Good News from Ontario" (The New Republic, August 23). The statement that the Mitchell Hepburn government was the first liberal one in the history of Ontario was incorrect. A liberal administration ruled the province from 1872 until 1905.

From Mark Starr, educational director of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, with headquarters in New York City, comes endorsement of our editorial, "Labor and the Intellectuals," in the August 9 issue, in which we regretted Philip Murray's criticism of the role of intellectuals in the labor movement. Murray himself does not seem to practise any prejudice "against professors and individuals who have had contact with colleges, books and ideas," says Mr. Starr. He cites the fact that on the central CIO staff are people like Len De Caux, J. Raymond Walsh, Kermit Eby, Katherine H. Pollak, Lee Pressman and, until recently, Ralph Hetzel Jr. Even in the days of the SWOC, says Mr. Starr, Murray had prominent staff members like Harold J. Ruttenberg, "who certainly could not be classed with the un-intelligentsia." He continues:

> What Murray probably had in mind as a source of his annoyance was the person with ideas which took the form of a pet panacea to be applied from the outside to the labor unions. I am sure that Murray does not for one moment reject the help of intellectuals (men and women who think, read and study and have skills in transmitting ideas and information) who come to serve the labor movement and assist the growth of the unions based upon their own natural development.
>
> Everybody knows that the trade unions in their recent meteoric growth to over thirteen million members need ideas and assistance wherever they can be found to meet new and great responsibilities in a complicated wartime world. Unions need greater administrative efficiency in their own offices. Their new members need help to maintain all that is good in union conditions of group solidarity and of opposition to racial discrimination and to retain internal democracy inside the unions without becoming the prey of factional groups subject to outside discipline. Above all, the unions need help in doing a better public-relations job. The prevalent view of unions was written into the Smith-Connally Act. Anti-union interests have succeeded in putting over a dangerously untrue picture of union activity. It is as if our army were judged by the AWOL soldiers in the guardhouse.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Books in Review

## Preface to Tragedy

OVER SEVEN YEARS have gone by since the generals rose against the Spanish Republic, but Mr. Brenan's account of the period from 1931 to 1936 is very timely nonetheless. The fall of Mussolini has sounded the doom of fascist dictators throughout Europe, and it is now clear beyond dispute that Spain sooner or later will regain democratic government. "The Spanish Labyrinth" [1] therefore is more than a good history—it is an indispensable handbook on the errors that the Third Spanish Republic must not repeat if it is to avoid the fate of its predecessor.

Mr. Brenan is excellently equipped for his task. A former British army officer, he settled down to farm in Spain after the last World War, and he remained there, a witness of many of the events he describes, until after the Franco uprising. It is clear that he has consulted most if not all of the available documents, and his chapters on agricultural conditions in Spain—which are essential to an understanding of the reforms that the Republic tried to carry out—are particularly outstanding.

I think, however, that his book should be read with caution. Mr. Brenan is obviously in full sympathy with the aims of the Spanish people, and his remarks on Franco's use of Moorish troops to suppress the Asturian revolt of 1934 should dispel any illusions that may still exist concerning this "Christian gentleman's" code of behavior.

But it seems to me that he has exaggerated the effect of the Republic's undoubted failures. He has concentrated upon events within Spain, ignoring almost completely the effect of Axis intervention against the Republic, and he clearly believes that the Republic itself, and not Hitler's and Mussolini's troops, was the architect of Franco's victory. Many students of Spain (including the reviewer) believe that, despite the bad strategy of such men as Largo Caballero and Casares Quiroga, the Republic would have saved itself but for the "non-intervention" policy of the British, French and American appeasers.

In any case, the errors committed by the Republic were serious and Mr. Brenan performs a useful service in pointing them out. There was, of course, no easy way to solve such stubborn and intractable problems as the great estates, the role of the Church and the Army; these difficulties were complicated by the demands of the Catalan and Basque nationalists (I think he has been rather unfair to them, and particularly to the Basques), the rival faiths of the Anarchists and Socialists, and in general the divisions that soon developed among the assorted groups that overthrew Alfonso.

Mr. Brenan's analysis of the situation at the end of 1933, when the Rightists came into power, is an excellent indication of the dilemma which confronted the Republic:

> What was the cause of the failure? Briefly, that the Republic had alienated large sections of the middle classes without giving satisfaction to the peasants and factory workers. Had it, as Lerroux desired, contented itself with being a continuation, in a somewhat enlightened form, of the Monarchy, it would have drawn all the middle classes around it. But it would then have united all the working classes against it and, since their claims could no longer be denied, a revolutionary situation would have developed. If, on the other hand, it had gone deeper, throwing open all the large estates to the peasants and to the political organizations that controlled them, it would have risked initiating a social revolution and being carried out of its depth. The Army would then have intervened "to restore order." It chose therefore a middle course—which in Spain, one must remember, is always the line of greatest resistance.

Mr. Brenan believes that a nationwide civil war became inevitable as a result of the Socialist uprising of 1934 (for which he holds Largo Caballero and President Alcalá Zamora jointly responsible) and the cruelty with which it was put down. All hope of saving the Republic was destroyed, he thinks, by the subsequent refusal of Largo Caballero to join with the other leftist groups in a final effort to carry out the Republic's reforms. (The explanation, Mr. Brenan says, is that Largo Caballero was expecting or inviting an Army putsch, which, he thought, would end with the workers in real control.) And he contends that the Republic's cause was irrevocably doomed by the failure of Casares Quiroga, Prime Minister when the Franco uprising began, to take adequate preparatory measures. He explains that Casares Quiroga was tubercular and "reacted to the danger of the situation by an optimism that would have to be considered insane if it were not a symptom of his disease."

But apart from these errors of individual judgment, what were the basic failures of the Republic? Mr. Brenan answers, surprisingly enough, that one was the anti-clerical measures adopted in the early days of the Republic. It is his contention that the Spanish Church, or at least the lower clergy, would have helped to suppress the landowners' special privileges, and that they were needlessly alienated by such measures as the reduction in the state grant to the Church, which of course affected their own salaries. The author also asserts that although only 20 percent of the Spanish people are really Catholic, it is impossible to set up a lasting regime in Spain if the Church is irrevocably opposed to it. That may be, but in view of the fact that Cardinal Segura, then primate, and other members of the hierarchy were irrevocably opposed to the Republic, it is hard to see how the village *curas* could have supported it.

It is also Mr. Brenan's view that the Republic might have conciliated the Army; several generals who later rose against it, notably Mola and Queipo de Llano, were freemasons at that time, and the Army was mostly liberal (or anti-clerical) during the civil wars of the nineteenth century. However, in view of the fact that the Republic was committed to end the Moroccan adventure, and deliberately renounced war as an instrument of national policy, there was never much chance of making the generals into militant Republicans.

[1] The Spanish Labyrinth, by Gerald Brenan. New York: The Macmillan Company. 360 pages. $3.75.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There will be general agreement with Mr. Brenan, however, that the cardinal failure of the Republic was its failure to do something about the land problem, and particularly to break up the great estates. He emphasizes one important explanation which is frequently overlooked: the division among the two principal leftist groups over the best procedure. For the Socialists, greatly impressed by the Soviet collective farms, wished to preserve the *latifundios* intact—which was, in fact, the method best suited to Spanish farming conditions. But the Anarchists wanted to divide the land among the peasants in small individual plots, and the result was that the peasants in Extremadura finally seized some of the estates themselves.

Mr. Brenan appears to believe that, given the necessary stability, the program of Indelacio Prieto's right-wing Socialists would offer the best program for Spain when the day of its liberation arrives. But he is obviously doubtful whether that stability can be obtained, and he offers no ready-made formula for the Republican leaders now discussing these matters in Mexico City and London.

Nevertheless, some sort of minimum program, similar to the Pact of San Sebastian of 1930, which mapped out the Republic's program, must and will be arrived at. "The Spanish Labyrinth," pessimistic though it is, does contribute to a better understanding of the Republic and therefore should help prevent foreign intervention in the future against democratic government in Spain.

THOMAS J. HAMILTON

# Notes on a Harvest

*New Poems: 1943, edited by Oscar Williams. New York: Howell, Soskin Company. 325 pages. $2.75.*
*American Decade, edited by Tom Boggs. Cummington: The Cummington Press. 93 pages. Trade edition, $3.50; hand bound, $7.50.*
*Arenas, by Tom Boggs. New York: Coward-McCann. 56 pages. $1.50.*

WHAT IS most unquestioned and assumed by a culture, the way it sees and the way it feels, its values in the daily life, history cannot show. This is the function of poetry, which, in the process of exposing and naming, changes those values—but only a poetry that is most deeply rooted in reality. Because the great poet is a very rare bird, blending so well with the scenery that he is often unobserved, an anthology of poems by lesser figures is the next best choice.

Oscar Williams, an old hand at anthologies, has just published his third annual volume, "New Poems: 1943." Among the selections I thought most rewarding were several poems by Ann Ridler, little known in this country, whose clean outlines of form contain rare expressions. W. H. Auden's "In the Manger," part of an unpublished Christmas Oratorio, and a poem called "Mundus et Infans" enhance his stature. "In Distrust of Merits," by Marianne Moore is a "war poem" of such passionate sincerity that its existence ought to be a reproof and an example to the shoddy propaganda of the films and the radio. I was glad to find work by two recent and original poets, Robert Lowell and Vernon Watkins. In a negative way, the flatulent bombast of several other poets (choose your own names), hyper-conscious of their writing "Poetry," made the good things seem still better.

Our generation has experienced a close union of English and American poetry. This may be due to the common sorrow of the depression and the war, or the transmigration of poets from both countries (Eliot, Auden), or the export of Hollywood and Tin Pan Alley culture to the English masses, but whatever the cause, the subjects, techniques and traditions of poets on both sides of the ocean have merged. From now on no anthology of American poetry will be inclusive unless English poets are there also, and vice versa. This makes "New Poems: 1943" significant.

Tom Boggs has "read some 500,000 [sic] poems to select the 68 . . ." for "American Decade," put out by the Cummington Press. For so much labor sown, it is a skimpy, disappointing harvest. This, I believe, is the fault of Mr. Boggs's approach which has led him to choose those poems which "reflect . . . their time" most brightly—which must be the time as he, not the poet, sees it—instead of for their excitement and revelation.

Two schools of American poets have had most popular appeal during the past twenty years, the Yearning Pussy and the Tough Tom. The first had Edna Millay as its prime mover, and the second, more numerous, contained such poets as Sandburg, Jeffers, Fearing. This last group is the best represented in the anthology. A considerable number of pages are devoted to Kenneth Fearing, whose needle is still stuck in the same cracked record; e. e. cummings, who has written some good lyrics, has three chances here, none of which wins the kewpee; there is a selection from Carl Sandburg.

But one looks in vain for anything by Marianne Moore, whose best poems, and they are many, are granite. There is nothing by Allen Tate or any of the imposing Southern group. Two of the best young American poets, Delmore Schwartz and Randall Jarrell, are missing.

On the other side, Wallace Stevens works a few of his casual miracles, which, to this hungry book, are fish and bread. R. P. Blackmur has two poems from his too little known "From Jordan's Delight." There is work by Karl Shapiro, Robert Frost, Theodore Spencer, Malcolm Cowley and others, which gives the anthology some grudging value.

Tom Boggs's first book of poems, "Arenas," is more distinguished. The best, which include "Poem," "Morgue," "Sunset Hill," are graceful and melodic as good lyrics should be. I have read these many times, and, like cornelian, the more they are handled the more they shine. Yet there are others, like "Flower . . ." or "Consolation," which lose out by melodramatizing the rhythm at the end, or by obtruding the poetic into a simple statement. But these are from a section called "Some Earlier Poems," and the fault is not in his later work.

The precise expression of obscure feeling is so rare in much modern poetry that its achievement by Mr. Boggs is enough to forgive a constricted scope. His book is a spider's web of particulars, bits of life snatched from the passing whole and embalmed with the juice still in them. Although one has the feeling that a larger creation would break that web and that a great deal might be lost, the bag is surprisingly ample and various. The few poems which seem most recently trapped are trophies of a weaver growing between the poles of craft and sensibility.

MILTON KLONSKY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Linguistic Imperialism

*Basic English and Its Uses, by I. A. Richards. New York: W. W. Norton Company. 143 pages. $2.*

WHO COULD DREAM of a better press agent than Mr. Winston Churchill? In his Harvard speech, he mentioned Basic English, and the American public wonders: "Where has Basic been all our lives?" Mr. Churchill, a world statesman, does recognize the necessity of a world language. He notes that in this war the possession of a common tongue was of incalculable benefit to the two great Western democracies. Nations, of course, may fight because they understand each other too well. But on the whole, between peoples of the same speech, every war is a civil war, a moral disaster unrelieved by any sense of glory.

Basic is not a language, but a method. It consists of ruthless simplification both in vocabulary and syntax, guided by logic. As an introduction to standard English it is an excellent pedagogical device. But it is merely an introduction. No one will rest satisfied with eight hundred and fifty words. The crudest trade—even politics—requires many more technical terms than that.

It is highly to the credit of Mr. Richards that he recognizes the need of an international, or supra-national, language. No panacea, of course: there are wars among people of the same speech, and they are the bitterest of all. No world organization, however—justice, police or trade—will be working without a convenient medium. But there are two possible solutions: to select a national language, or to adopt a neutral one. Mr. Richards prefers the first, and "Basic English" is his answer. It seems to me that he overlooks several decisive factors.

First of all, he willfully ignores the possibilities of a neutral language. He accepts as final the unthinking verdict of "hardheaded persons": "Crackpot schemes!" Surely he must know that the Catholic Church—the first and only International—is still conducting its affairs in Latin. He claims to be familiar with the various proposals for a neutral auxiliary language; but he artfully dissembles his knowledge. He gives no inkling of the grand-scale demonstration that Esperanto has been carrying on for half a century. He never mentions De Wahl's "Occidental" or Peano's "Interlingua," far more significant than Jesperson's "Novial." He omits any reference to the very thorough scholarly work done over a number of years by the staff of the International Auxiliary Language Association.

On the other hand, Mr. Richards betrays, or rather displays, the magnificent insularity which is the pride of the Anglo-Saxon mind. He is aware of the problem, and states it with true Basic lucidity: "It [a common language] must be clear from any threat to the economic, moral, cultural, social or political status of any person or any people. It must carry no implications of intellectual, technological or other domination. No one in learning the world language must have any excuse for even the least shadow of a feeling that he is submitting to an alien influence or being brought under the power of other groups." Then he proceeds to propose exactly what he himself so definitely condemned.

For the adoption of English as the supra-national language would imply the acknowledgment of Anglo-Saxon supremacy. The proof of this is that the arguments adduced by Mr. Richards are all based on our manifold superiorities: we are richer, more numerous, more civilized, more virtuous than the rest, and this is to be the Anglo-American century.

Of course, at the peace settlement, we can impose the recognition of this supremacy. We can make English the official world language, with Basic as a modest practical approach. We can do it. It will be resented as all other forms of tribal Anglo-Saxon pride are already resented. This arrogant insularity must go, if we are to know peace.

All dreams of "imperialism" should be exorcized, including linguistic imperialism, which sums up all the rest. The best policy would be to apply the method of Basic, not to English, but to the vast international vocabulary which already exists, and which is mostly Anglo-Latin. The result would be neutral enough: for although purely "Western," it would not be associated with any political power. It is on this basis that the International Auxiliary Language Association has been working for years. That is where Mr. I. A. Richards belongs, if he be truly a philosopher and a world citizen, not a chauvinist in "orthological" clothing.

ALBERT GUÉRARD

# Stranger Than Fiction

*The Day of Reckoning, by Max Radin. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 144 pages. $1.75.*

SOME OF MY GOOD FRIENDS, mostly writing people, far removed from the responsibility of government, have urged that the solution in Germany is to sterilize all Germans. Others, less timid, urge that all Germans be killed. Psychiatrists urge the reëducation of the German people on the assumption that it is a mass paranoiac society. Quite a number of people, aware of the administrative realistic problems implicit in handling the German population and its leaders, have prepared lists of German leaders by name, title and functions *vis-a-vis* individual or group responsibility and culpability. And now comes one of my favorite lawyer-writers-for-laymen—Max Radin—with an entrancing volume conjuring up a formal legal trial of Hitler Goebbels, Himmler, von Ribbentrop, Funk, Gastein and Milch.

A sample, symbolic trial is set in Luxemburg. Five commissioners compose the court. They are representatives of the peoples of China, Russia, the United States, England and Australia. A German counsel, eminent in the field of international law, is assigned to defend the seven men on trial. Charges have been properly prepared and presented to the defendants. The trial is not a mere show piece to wreak vengeance on Hitler and his gang or even to educate the peoples of the world. The very concept of such a trial is a mighty compliment to our Anglo-Saxon faith in fair hearing, right of confrontation of witnesses and the right of cross-examination of witnesses. Only one disturbing element appears in this volume. One of our great valiant allies, Russia, has failed to adopt those simple protective measures to ascertain guilt—for high or low, for misdemeanors or crimes. This is one of the fundamental distinctions between Communist Russia and the other Allies. Maybe having a Russian representative sit on such a court would help to persuade Communist doctrinaires that the state as well as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the individual is safer in a society living under a bill of rights rather than a dictatorship.

The essence of the Radin concept, which makes the book delightful reading, lies in the fact that three little humble people were pushed around by the Nazis; pushed around is an understatement for the word "killed." With meticulous care, proof is introduced inch by inch showing, for example, that Jacques Debosque, a citizen and resident of France, was shot on June 10, 1942, without charges, trial or hearing, on orders flowing from Mr. Hitler and the other defendants. The verdict is "Guilty of Murder," but before proceedings get under way, the dignified attorney for the defendants protests the jurisdiction of the court. The representatives of the press admire this great German advocate and the attitude of the newspapermen toward the arguments offered by the defense is tough and realistic. There are no cameras in the courtroom and cards for admission are controlled; in short, this is a state trial but not a show like the "Mission to Moscow" purge spectacle.

It may well be said that such a trial would be silly and useless because if the judges failed to find "guilt," the judges themselves would be killed. Some may argue that Radin's thesis is idle chatter because, of necessity, the people of the occupied lands will, within a few days after the surrender of Germany, do away with the Nazi leaders and nobody will be able to stop them even though such a blood purge might continue to the point where it would become difficult to reinstate order. Others might hold to the opinion that there is little educational value in a trial such as Radin proposes. Still others may argue that the trial would merely enhance the symbols of martyrdom inherent in the minds of the Nazi people for their unfortunate leaders.

Be this as it may, the book is swell reading and in its fashion makes a real contribution to our general thinking on the acute problem of what to do with the Nazi leaders. If the United Nations are to police the new world of the future, then some court and some Radin-like procedure will have to be established for the future. Whether so close to the end of the war we can now take this first step toward judicial determination of international-leadership guilt is another question, a question, however, not of right or wrong but merely one of man's capacity to try his fellow man—a euphemism which might include Hitler and his group.

MORRIS L. ERNST

# The Voice of Enterprise

*The Spirit of Enterprise, by Edgar M. Queeny. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 267 pages. $2.*
*Government, Business and Values, by Beardsley Ruml. New York: Harper and Brothers. 52 pages. $1.*
*Liberty, Employment and No More Wars, by Theodore K. Quinn. New York: Hastings House. 241 pages. $2.50.*
*Government and Business Tomorrow, by Donald R. Richberg. New York: Harper and Brothers. 194 pages. $2.50.*

BUSINESS LEADERS are finding it necessary to restate their attitudes in a world increasingly dominated by government. They know that the future will demand a more strict accounting of their economic stewardship. Many of them are intelligently preparing to assume their new responsibilities to society. A few are stiff-necked; protesting against new ways they betray a bitter nostalgia for the past.

Edgar M. Queeny's "The Spirit of Enterprise" represents the business mind at the height of intransigence. His purpose, he says, is merely to answer the challenge to private enterprise made by the New Deal, Stuart Chase, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the British Labor Party, Karl Marx, Thorstein Veblen, Harold Laski and the TNEC. Mr. Queeny, however, fails to offer anything but a ranting, rambling discourse on how the New Deal has "done in" business. Obliquely, of course, it's all That Man's fault.

Throughout the book a blind, uncompromisingly violent hatred for all economic and social reform is evident. Accompanying himself on a Horatio Alger tom-tom the author sings his ode to reaction. Unemployment is a sign of social maturity. It has always existed and it must continue to exist as a mark of our liberal civilization. Corporate concentration and monopoly is a myth fostered, no doubt, by those very labor leaders who continually stir up disruption. The NRPB's "American Beveridge Report" is as meaningful

LANGUAGES
BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

OUR MEN NEED ★ BOOKS ★

That book you've enjoyed — pass it along to a man in uniform. Leave it at the nearest collection center or public library for the 1943

★

VICTORY BOOK CAMPAIGN

SEND ALL YOU CAN SPARE

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

Brothers of Men
Published Quarterly
LAWRENCE W. NEFF, Editor
A positive approach to religion, divested of cumbersome conventional dogmas.
IN THE CURRENT NUMBER:
"Collapsing Christianity": Inherent Contradictions Point to Incurable Cleavage.
"Jesus No Pale Pacifist": An Appraisal and Appreciation of Earth's Finest Fighter.
"Brothers of Men": A Nucleus of the Brotherliness That Must Save Civilization.
$1.00 a year; single copy 25¢
BANNER PRESS, Publishers Since 1919
Emory University (Atlanta), Ga.

CHALLENGE
A fighting Socialist paper for thinking youth
We kowtow to no advertisers or fat boys. Single copies, 5¢; year subscription, 50¢. CHALLENGE, Young People's Socialist League, 303 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y.

HILLTOP LODGE
ON BEAUTIFUL SYLVAN LAKE
R. R. Sta., Pawling, N. Y.
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Only 65 Miles from New York City
Every Sport & Recreation • Golf Free
P. Wolfson & S. Rothauser, Directors
N. Y. Office: 277 Broadway • CO 7-3958

A VACATION HAVEN 40 MILES FROM N. Y.
CENTRAL VALLEY N. Y.
Birdland
Formerly Lewisohn's Estate OPEN ALL YEAR
225-acre estate of fascinating hiking country. Tennis, Swimming, Golf, Handball, Bicycles, Ping-pong, Games, recordings, library, dancing. Excellent cuisine. Every comfort. Incomparable surroundings. Adults. Tel.: Highland Mills 7895. Hostess: FANNIE GOLDBERG

EVERY MINUTE... A JOYFUL MEMORY
On shore of sand lake. Modern. Run'g water all rms. Steam heat. Boating, bathing, tennis, handball, softball. Splendid food. Open all year. Write for Bklt. 'N' or tel. N. Y. Off. LO. 5-3716.
LAKE REST HOTEL
SHANDELEE, LIVINGSTON MANOR, N.Y.
Rates upon Request

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a telephone book. The TNEC inquiry was part of a New Deal plot to socialize the nation's resources. Rationing becomes a New Deal plot. The Four Freedoms are nonsense for they will turn America into a country of contented cows and will strangle the free, virile spirit of individualism. Only one freedom is needed—Freedom of Enterprise.

The crassness inherent in the author's views is most clearly displayed by his obvious misrepresentation of Veblen's writings, his wild distortions of history and his extraordinary inaccuracies. Veblen, for example, taught at Columbia University, Harold Rugg, the famous educator, is called Rugge and Thurman Arnold is credited with writing a book entitled "The Folklore of Planning." Immigrants to America after 1870 were illiterate and brought with them the Marxist hatreds of European cities. They brought the labor agitator and the concept of social planning. They settled in large cities—especially New York—and almost immediately began to conspire for an American soviet. As Stephen Leacock once dryly remarked, you take some undigested history, stew it in stale economics, garnish with green geography and you get a most curious kind of claptrap.

It is with a sharp sense of relief that we turn away from these preposterous fulminations to the well written and clear-headed discussion of Beardsley Ruml's "Government, Business and Values." In contrast to Queeny, Ruml explicitly asserts planning to be the antithesis of regimentation. Post-war planning, he convincingly argues, can be converted into a cohesive force that will give meaning to our present efforts. Mr. Ruml knows that private enterprise must be able to offer jobs to all if it is to play the post-war role it desires. He is as much a believer in individualism as is Queeny. Yet he realizes that the human spirit decays in the dry-rot of depression engendered by a robber-baron faith in "rugged individualism." Mr. Ruml does not want to displace private enterprise. But he wants a society that will foster a feeling of belonging and personal significance —a feeling he calls "homefulness." If that means planning and government activity, Mr. Ruml is not afraid.

Theodore K. Quinn, in his "Liberty, Employment and No More Wars," offers the business man's practical supplement to Mr. Ruml's views. He knows his economic history and is not possessed by an easy nostalgia. He strongly affirms, however, that capitalism can be made to work. Mr. Quinn's major problem is a political one—how to attain a maximum of participation in economic affairs with a minimum of state centralization. This may be achieved, he suggests, by the establishment of an Economic Senate which would coördinate all business activities. The exclusion of labor and farmers, though, leads one to suspect that Mr. Quinn's Senate would be rapidly transformed into a supercartel. If that were so, and the author's conditions make it highly probable, it would utterly destroy the aims of the proposed organization.

Donald Richberg's rather discursive "Government and Business Tomorrow" is also concerned with the place of private industry in our future economy. He emphasizes peaceful bargaining as a method of resolving differences among labor, industry, farmers and consumers. Mr. Richberg presents a slightly more reasonable version of the spirit of enterprise. His basic principles, shorn of the panoply of high idealism, are revealed as the elimination of governmental restrictions on business, admonitions *ad infinitum* to labor to behave itself, the maintenance of a free competitive economy and an opposition to the use of taxation as a social instrument. How such concepts may be adapted to the world of tomorrow without repeating the disasters of yesterday is not made clear.

BEN B. SELIGMAN

# A Reader's List

PLANNING; NO. 210. THE GAS INDUSTRY IN WARTIME (available through The New Republic, 25 cents.) This pamphlet supplements Planning No. 197, "Coal and the War," and No. 204, "Facts about Electricity Supply." It deals with the administration and functions of the gas industry in wartime England. PEP describes the government agencies controlling and aiding gas production. The role of the gas industry in civil defense, labor problems and statistics on consumption and supply are briefly presented. Fuel economy, important in a wartime economy, is outlined, stressing the responsibility of legislation and rationing. The gas industry and the government administration are aware of the necessity for post-war planning and are taking steps to formulate such plans.

GIVE US A LITTLE SMILE, BABY, by Harry W. Coleman (Dutton, $3). The memories of an old-time newspaper photographer, who describes his era as "B. J."—that is, before journalism. Mr. Coleman writes mostly for laughs and often works too hard for them. Some of the illustrations are more amusing than the text.

## Contributors

GAETANO SALVEMINI has been in exile from Italy for the past ten years because of his opposition to the Fascist dictatorship. He is co-author, with George La Piana, of "What to Do with Italy," recently published by Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

LOUIS DOLIVET is the editor of Free World.

BOGDAN RADITSA was named chief of the foreign-press division of the Yugoslav government in 1940 but was removed before taking up his duties, at the intercession of the Axis Foreign Ministers, Ciano and Ribbentrop. His anti-Fascist articles in the European press had made him undesirable. He is the author of "Conversations with Guglielmo Ferrero" and "The Agony of Europe."

EDWIN A. LAHEY is a member of the staff of the Washington Bureau of The Chicago Daily News. He is one the country's leading labor reporters.

THOMAS J. HAMILTON was a correspondent for The New York Times. He is the author of "Appeasement's Child: the Franco Regime in Spain," published by Alfred A. Knopf.

ALBERT GUÉRARD is the author of several books on French civilization. His latest book, "Napoleon III: An Interpretation," has just been published by Harvard University Press.

MILTON KLONSKY is a young poet who has been honorably discharged from the army and is now living in New York City.

MORRIS L. ERNST is an attorney in New York City. He has successfully defended almost every case involving literary censorship during the past seventeen years and is the author of several books on censorship.

BEN B. SELIGMAN is with the Office of Price Administration in New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED